

The

American Historical Review

THE SIFTED GRAIN AND THE GRAIN SIFTERS¹

ON occasions such as this, a text upon which to discourse is not usual ; I propose to venture an exception to the rule. I shall, moreover, offer not one text only, but two ; taken, the first, from a discourse prepared in the full theological faith of the seventeenth century, the other from the most far-reaching scientific publication of the century now drawing to its close.

"God sifted a whole Nation that He might send choice Grain over into this Wilderness," said William Stoughton in the election sermon preached according to custom before the Great and General Court of Massachusetts in April, 1668. To the same effect Charles Darwin wrote in 1871 : "There is apparently much truth in the belief that the wonderful progress of the United States, as well as the character of the people, are the results of natural selection ; for the more energetic, restless and courageous men from all parts of Europe have emigrated during the last ten or twelve generations to that great country and have there succeeded best ;" and the quiet, epoch-marking, creed-shaking naturalist then goes on to express this startling judgment, which, uttered by an American, would have been deemed the very superlative of national vanity :—" Looking to the distant future, I do not think [it] an exaggerated view [to say that] all other series of events—as that which resulted in the culture of mind in Greece, and that which resulted in the Empire of Rome—only appear to have purpose and value when viewed in connection with, or rather as subsidiary to, the great stream of Anglo-Saxon emigration to the West."²

Such are my texts ; but, while I propose to preach from them largely and to them in a degree, I am not here to try to instruct

¹ An Address at the Dedication of the Building of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin at Madison, October 19, 1900.

² *The Descent of Man* (ed. 1874), II. 218, 219.

you to-day in the history of your own state of Wisconsin, or in the magic record relating to the development of what we see fit to call the Northwest. Indeed I am not here as an individual at all; nor as one in any way specially qualified to do justice to the occasion. I am here simply as the head for the time being of what is unquestionably the oldest historical society in America, and, if reference is made to societies organized exclusively for the preservation of historical material and the furtherance of historical research, one than which few indeed anywhere in existence are more ancient of years. As the head of the Massachusetts Historical Society, I have been summoned to contribute what I may in honor of the completion of this edifice, the future home of a similar society, already no longer young;—a society grown up in a country which, when the Massachusetts institution was formed, was yet the home of aboriginal tribes,—a forest-clad region known only to the frontiersman and explorer. Under such circumstances, I did not feel that I had a right not to answer the call. It was as if in our older Massachusetts time the pastor of the Plymouth, or of the Salem or Boston church had been invited to the gathering of some new brotherhood in the Connecticut Valley, or the lighting of another candle of the Lord on the Concord or the Nashua, there to preach the sermon of ordination and extend the right hand of fellowship.

And in this connection let me here mention one somewhat recondite historical circumstance relating to this locality. You here may be more curiously informed, but few indeed in Massachusetts are to-day knowing of the fact that this portion of Wisconsin—Madison itself, and all the adjoining counties—was once, territorially, a part of the royally assigned limits of Massachusetts. Yet such was undisputedly the fact; and it lends a certain propriety, not the less poetic because remote, to my acceptance of the part here to-day assigned me.

Accepting that part, I none the less, as I have said, propose to break away from what is the usage in such cases. That usage, if I may have recourse to an old theological formula, is to improve the occasion historically. An address, erudite and bristling with statistics, would now be in order. An address in which the gradual growth of the community or the institution should be developed, and its present condition set forth; with suitable reference to the days of small things, and a tribute of gratitude to the founders, and those who patiently built their lives into the edifice, and made of it their monument. The names of all such should, I agree, be cut deep over its portico; but this task, eminently proper on such occasions, I, a stranger, shall not undertake here and now to perform.

For it others are far better qualified. I do not, therefore, propose to tell you of the St. Francis Xavier mission at Green Bay, or of Nicollet; of Jacques Cartier, of Marquette or of Radisson, any more than of those two devoted benefactors and assiduous secretaries of this institution, Lyman C. Draper and Reuben G. Thwaites; but, leaving them, and their deeds and services, to be commemorated by those to the manner born, and, consequently, in every respect better qualified than I for the work, I propose to turn to more general subjects and devote the time allotted me to generalities, and to the future rather than to the past.

In an address delivered about eighteen months ago before the Massachusetts Historical Society, I discussed in some detail the modern conception of history as compared with that which formerly prevailed. I do not now propose to repeat what I then said. It is sufficient for my present purpose to call attention to what we of the new school regard as the dividing line between us and the historians of the old school, the first day of October, 1859,—the date of the publication of Darwin's "Origin of Species;" the book of his immediately preceding the "Descent of Man," from which my text for to-day was taken. On the first day of October, 1859, the Mosaic cosmogony finally gave place to the Darwinian theory of evolution. Under the new dispensation, based not on chance or an assumed supernatural revelation, but on a patient study of biology, that record of mankind known as history, no longer a mere succession of traditions and annals, has become a unified whole,—a vast scheme systematically developing to some result as yet not understood. Closely allied to astronomy, geology and physics, the study of modern history seeks a scientific basis from which the rise and fall of races and dynasties will be seen merely as phases of a consecutive process of evolution,—the evolution of man from his initial to his ultimate state. When this conception was once reached, history, ceasing to be a mere narrative, made up of disconnected episodes having little or no bearing on each other, became a connected whole. To each development, each epoch, race and dynasty its proper place was to be assigned; and to assign that place was the function of the historian. Formerly each episode was looked upon as complete in itself; and, being so, it had features more or less dramatic or instructive, and, for that reason, tempting to the historian, whether investigator or literary artist,—a Freeman or a Froude. Now, the first question the historian must put to himself relates to the proper adjustment of his particular theme to the entire plan,—he is shaping the fragment of a vast mosaic. The incomparably greater portion of history has, it is needless to say,

little value,—not much more than the biography of the average individual ; it is a record of small accomplishment,—in many instances a record of no accomplishment at all, perhaps of retrogression ;—for we cannot all be successful, nor even everlastingly and effectively strenuous. Among nations in history, as among men we know, the commonplace is the rule ; but, whether ordinary or exceptional,—conspicuous or obscure,—each has its proper place, and to it that place should be assigned.

Having laid down this principle, I, eighteen months ago, proceeded to apply it to the society I was then addressing, and to the history of the commonwealth whose name that society bears ; and I gave my answer to it, such as that answer was. The same question I now put as concerns Wisconsin ; and to that also I propose to venture an answer. As my text has indicated, that answer, also, will not, in a sense, be lacking in ambition. In the history of Wisconsin I shall seek to find verification of what Darwin suggested,—evidence of the truth of the great law of natural selection as applied also to man.

Thus stated, the theme is a large one, and may be approached in many ways ; and, in the first place, I propose to approach it in the way usual with modern historical writers. I shall attempt to assign, to Wisconsin its place in the sequence of recent development ; for it is only during the last fifty years that Wisconsin has exercised any, even the most imperceptible, influence on what is conventionally agreed upon as history. That this region before the year 1848 had an existence, we know ; as we also know that, since the last glacial period when the earth's surface hereabouts assumed its present geographical form,—some five thousand, or, perhaps, ten, or even twenty thousand years ago,—it has been occupied by human beings,—fire-making, implement-using, garment-wearing, habitation-dwelling. With these we have now nothing to do. We, the historians, are concerned only with what may be called the mere fringe of Time's raiment,—the last half-century of the fifty or one hundred centuries ; the rest belong to the ethnologist and the geologist, not to us. But the last fifty years, again, so far as the evolution of man from a lower to a higher stage of development is concerned, though a very quickening period, has, after all, been but one stage, and not the final stage, of a distinct phase of development. That phase has now required four centuries in which to work itself out to the point as yet reached ; for it harks back to the discovery of America, and the movement towards religious freedom which followed close upon that discovery, though having no direct connection with it. Martin Luther and Christo-

opher Columbus had little in common except that their lives overlapped ; but those two dates, 1492 and 1517,—the landfall at San Salvador and the theses nailed on the church door at Wittenberg,—those two dates began a new chapter in human history, the chapter in which is recounted the fierce struggle over the establishment of the principles of civil and religious liberty, and the recognition of the equality of men before the law. For, speaking generally but with approximate correctness, it may be asserted that, prior to the year 1500, the domestic political action and the foreign complications of even the most advanced nations turned on other issues,—dynastic, predatory, social ; but, since that date, from the wars of Charles V., of Francis I., and of Elizabeth down to our own Confederate rebellion, almost every great struggle or debate has either directly arisen out of some religious dispute or some demand for increased civil rights, or, if it had not there its origin, it has invariably gravitated in that direction. Even Frederick of Prussia, the so-called Great—that skeptical, irreligious cut-purse of the Empire,—the disciple and protector of Voltaire and the apotheosized of Thomas Carlyle,—even Frederick figured as “the Protestant Hero ;” while Francis I. was “the Eldest Son of the Church,” and Henry VIII. received from Rome the title of “Defender of the Faith.”

Since the year 1500, on the other hand, what is known as modern history has been little more than a narrative of the episodes in the struggle not yet closed against arbitrary rule, whether by a priesthood or through divine right, or by the members of a caste or of a privileged class,—whether ennobled, plutocratic or industrial. The right of the individual man, no matter how ignorant or how poor, to think, worship and do as seems to him best, provided always in so doing he does not infringe upon the rights of others, has through these four centuries been, as it still is, the underlying issue in every conflict. It seems likely, also, to continue to be the issue for a long time to come, for it never was more firmly asserted or sternly denied than now ; though to-day the opposition comes, not, as heretofore, from above, but from below, and finds its widest and most formidable expression in the teachings of those socialists who preach a doctrine of collectivism, or the complete suppression of the individual.

That proposition, however, does not concern us here and now. Our business is with the middle period of the nineteenth century, and not with the first half of the twentieth ; and no matter how closely we confine ourselves to the subject in hand, space and time will scarcely be found in which properly to develop the theme.

Two and fifty years ago, when, in the summer of 1848, Wisconsin first took shape as an organized political organization,—a new factor in man's development,—human evolution was laboring over two problems,—nationality and slavery. Slavery—that is, the ownership of one man or one class of men by another man or class of men—had existed, and been accepted as a matter of course, from the beginning. Historically the proposition did not admit of doubt. In Great Britain, bondage had only recently disappeared, and in Russia it was still the rule; while among the less advanced nations its rightfulness was nowhere challenged. With us here in America it was a question of race. The equality of whites before the law was an article of political faith; not so that of the blacks. The Africans were distinctly an inferior order of being, and, as such, not only in the Southern or slave states, but throughout the North also, not entitled to the unrestricted pursuit on equal terms of life, liberty and happiness. Hence a fierce contention,—the phase, as it presented itself on the land discovered by Columbus in 1492, of the struggle inaugurated by Luther in 1517. Its work was thus, so to speak, cut out for Wisconsin in advance of its being,—its place in the design of the great historical scheme prenatally assigned to it. How then did it address itself to its task? how perform the work thus given it to do? Did it, standing in the front rank of progress, help the great scheme along? Or, identifying itself with that reactionist movement ever on foot, did it strive with the stars in their courses?

Here, in the United States, the form in which the issue of the future took shape between 1830, when it first presented itself, and 1848, when Wisconsin entered the sisterhood of states, is even yet only partially understood, in such occult ways did the forces of development interact and exercise influence on each other. For reasons not easy to explain, also, certain states came forward as the more active exponents of antagonistic ideas,—on the one side Massachusetts; on the other, first, Virginia, and, later, South Carolina. The great and long sustained debate which closed in an appeal to force in the spring of 1861 must now be conceded as something well-nigh inevitable from fundamental conditions which dated from the beginning. It was not a question of slavery; it was one of nationality. The issue had presented itself over and over again, in various forms and in different parts of the country ever since the Constitution had been adopted,—now in Pennsylvania; now in Kentucky; now in New England; even here in Wisconsin; but, in its most concrete form, in South Carolina. It was a struggle for mastery between centripetal and centrifugal forces. At the close, slavery

was, it is true, the immediate cause of quarrel, but the seat of disturbance lay deeper. In another country, and under other conditions, it was the identical struggle which, in feudal times, went on in Great Britain, in France and in Spain, and which, more recently, and in our own day only, we have seen brought to a close in Germany and in Italy,—the struggle of a rising spirit of nationality to overcome the clannish instinct,—the desire for local independence. In the beginning Virginia stood forward as the exponent of state sovereignty. Jefferson was its mouthpiece. It was he who drew up the famous Kentucky resolutions of 1798-99, and his election to the presidency in 1800 was the recognized victory of the school of states' rights over Federalism. Later the parties changed sides,—as political parties are wont to do. Possession of the government led to a marked modification of views ; new issues were presented ; and, in 1807, the policy which took shape in Jefferson's Embargo converted the Federalist into a disunion organization, which disappeared from existence in the famous Hartford Convention of 1814-15. New England was then the centre of the party of the centrifugal force, and the issues were commercial. Fortunately, up to 1815 the issue between the spirit of local sovereignty and the ever-growing sense of nationality had not taken shape over any matter of difference sufficiently great and far-reaching to provoke an appeal to force. Not the less for that was the danger of conflict there,—a sufficient cause and suitable occasion only were wanting, and those under ordinary conditions might be counted upon to present themselves in due course of time. They did present themselves in 1832, still under the economical guise. But now the moral issue lurked behind, though the South did not yet stand directly opposed to the advancing spirit of the age. But nullification—the logical outcome of the theory of absolute state sovereignty—was enunciated by Calhoun, and South Carolina took from Virginia the lead in the reactionary movement from nationality. The danger once more passed away ; but it is obvious to us now, and, it would seem, should have been plain to any cool-headed observer then, that, when the issue next presented itself, a trial of strength would be well-nigh inevitable. The doctrine of state sovereignty, having assumed the shape of nullification, would next develop that of secession, and the direct issue over nationality would be presented.

Almost before the last indications of danger over the economical question had disappeared, slavery loomed ominously up. They did not realize it at the time, but it was now an angry wrangle over a step in the progressive evolution of the human race. The equality of man before the law and his Maker was insisted upon, and was

denied. It was a portentous issue, for in it human destiny was challenged. The desperate risk the Southern States then took is plain enough now. They entered upon a distinctly reactionary movement against two of the foremost growing forces of human development, the tendency to nationality and the humanitarian spirit. Though they knew it not, they were arraying themselves against the very stars in their courses.

Under these circumstances the secession-slavery movement between 1835 and 1860 was a predestined failure. Because of fortuitous events—the chances of the battle-field, the impulse of individual genius, the exigencies of trade or the blunders of diplomats—it might easily have had an apparent and momentary triumph; but the result upon which the slave power, as such, was intent,—the creation about the Gulf of Mexico and in the Antilles of a great semi-tropical nationality, based on African servitude and a monopolized cotton production,—this result was in direct conflict with the irresistible tendencies of mankind in its present stage of development. A movement in all its aspects radically reactionary, it could at most have resulted only in a passing anomaly.

While the Southern, or Jamestown, column of Darwin's great Anglo-Saxon migration was thus following to their legitimate conclusions the teachings of Jefferson and Calhoun,—the Virginia and South Carolina schools of state sovereignty, slavery and secession,—the distinctively northern column,—that entering through the Plymouth and Boston portals,—instinctively adhering to those principles of Church and State in the contention over which it originated,—found its way along the southern shores of the Great Lakes, through northern Ohio, southern Michigan, and northern Illinois, and then, turning north and west, spread itself over the vast region beyond the great lakes, and towards the upper waters of the Mississippi. But it is very noteworthy how the lead and inspiration in this movement still came from the original source. While in the South it passed from Virginia to Carolina, in the North it remained in Massachusetts. Three men then came forward there, voicing more clearly than any or all others what was in the mind of the community in the way of aspiration, whether moral or political. Those three were: William Lloyd Garrison, Daniel Webster and John Quincy Adams; they were the prophetic voices of that phase of American political evolution then in process. Their messages, too, were curiously divergent; and yet, apparently contradictory, they were, in reality, supplementary to each other. Garrison developed the purely moral side of the coming issue. Webster preached nationality, under the guise of love of the Union. Adams,

combining the two, pointed out a way to the establishment of the rights of man under the Constitution and within the Union. While, in a general way, much historical interest attaches to the utterances and educational influence of those three men during the period under discussion, the future political attitude of Wisconsin, then nascent, was deeply affected by them. To this subject, therefore, I propose to devote some space; for, deserving attention, I am not aware that it has heretofore received it. In doing so I cannot ignore the fact of my own descent from one of the three I have named; but I may say in my own extenuation that John Quincy Adams was indisputably a considerable public character in his time, and when I, a descendant of his, undertake to speak of that time historically, I must, when he comes into the field of discussion, deal with him as best I may, assigning to him, as to his contemporaries, the place which, as I see it, is properly his or theirs. Moreover, I will freely acknowledge that an hereditary affiliation, if I may so express it, was not absent from the feeling which impelled me to accept your call. However much others had forgotten it, I well remembered that more than half a century ago, in the days of small things, it was in this region, as in central New York and the Western Reserve, that the seed cast by one from whom I claim descent fell in the good ground where it bore fruit an hundred fold.

Recurring, then, to the three men I have named as voicing systematically a message of special significance in connection with the phase of political evolution, or of development if that word is preferred, then going on,—Garrison's message was distinctly moral and humanitarian. In a sense, it was reactionary, and violently so. In it there was no appeal to patriotism, no recognition even of nationality. On the contrary, in the lofty atmosphere of humanitarianism in which he had his being, I doubt if Garrison ever inhaled a distinctively patriotic breath; while he certainly denounced the Constitution and assailed the Union. He saw only the moral wrong of slavery, its absolute denial of the fundamental principle of the equality of men before the law and before God; and the world became his,—where freedom was there was his country. To arouse the dormant conscience of the community by the fierce and unceasing denunciation of a great wrong was his mission; and he fulfilled it: but, curiously enough, the end he labored for came in the way he least foresaw, and through the very instrumentality he had most vehemently denounced,—it came within that Union which he had described as a compact with death, and under that Constitution which he had arraigned as a covenant with hell. Yet Garri-

son was undeniably a prophet, voicing the gospel as he saw it fearlessly and without pause. As such he contributed potently to the final result.

Next, Webster. It was the mission of Daniel Webster to preach nationality. In doing so he spoke in words of massive eloquence in direct harmony with the most pronounced aspiration of his time, —that aspiration which has asserted itself and worked the most manifest results of the nineteenth century in both hemispheres,— in Spain and Prussia during the Napoleonic war, in Russia during the long Slavonic upheaval, again more recently in Germany and in Italy, and finally in the United States. The names of Stein, of Cavour and of Bismarck are scarcely more associated with this great instinctive movement of the century than is that of Daniel Webster. His mission it was to preach to this people Union, one and indivisible ; and he delivered his message.

The mission of J. Q. Adams during his best and latest years, while a combination of that of the two others, was different from either. His message, carefully thought out, long retained, and at last distinctly enunciated, was his answer to the Jeffersonian theory of state sovereignty, and Calhoun's doctrine of nullification and its logical outcome, secession. With both theory and doctrine, and their results, he had during his long political career been confronted ; on both he had reflected much. It was during the administration of Jefferson and on the question of union that he had, in 1807, broken with his party and resigned from the Senate ; and with Calhoun he had been closely associated in the cabinet of Monroe. Calhoun also had occupied the vice-presidential chair during his own administration. He now met Calhoun face to face on the slavery issue, prophetically proclaiming a remedy for the moral wrong and the vindication of the rights of man, within the Union and under the Constitution, through the exercise of inherent war powers whenever an issue between the sections should assume the insurrectionary shape. In other words, Garrison's moral result was to be secured, not through the agencies Garrison advocated, but by force of that nationality which Webster proclaimed. This solution of the issue, J. Q. Adams never wearied of enunciating, early and late, by act, speech and letter ; and his view prevailed in the end. Lincoln's proclamation of January, 1863, was but the formal declaration of the policy enunciated by J. Q. Adams on the floor of Congress in 1836, and again in 1841, and yet again in greater detail in 1842.¹ It was he who thus brought the abstract moral doctrines of Garrison into unison of movement with the nationality of Webster.

¹ See Appendix, *post*.

The time now drew near when Wisconsin was to take her place in the Union, and exert her share of influence on the national polity, and through that polity on a phase of political evolution. South Carolina, by the voice of Calhoun, was preaching reaction, through slavery and in defiance of nationality: Massachusetts, through Garrison and Webster, was proclaiming the moral idea and nationality as abstractions; while J. Q. Adams confronted Calhoun with the ominous contention that, the instant he or his had recourse to force, that instant the moral wrong could be made good by the sword wielded in defence of nationality and in the name of the Constitution.

As 1848 waxed old, the debate grew angry. J. Q. Adams died in the early months of that memorable year; but his death in no way affected the course of events. The leadership in the anti-slavery struggle on the floor of Congress and within the limits of the Constitution had passed from him four years before. He was too old longer to bear the weight of armor, or to wield weapons once familiar; but the effect of his teachings remained, and they were living realities wherever the New England column had penetrated,—throughout central New York, in the "Western Reserve," and especially in the region which bordered on Lake Michigan. Garrison still declaimed against the Union as an unholy alliance with sin; while, in the mind of Webster, his sense of the wrong of slavery was fast being overweighted by apprehension for nationality. In the mean time, a war of criminal aggression against Mexico in behalf of Calhoun's reactionary movement had been brought to a close, and the question was as to the partition of plunder. On that great issue hinged, and over it was fought the presidential election of 1848. A little more than fifty years ago, that was the first election in which Wisconsin participated. The number of those who now retain a distinct recollection of the canvass of 1848, and the questions then so earnestly debated are not many; I chance to be one of those few. I recall one trifling incident connected, not with the canvass but with the events of that year, which, for some reason, made an impression upon me, and now illustrates curiously the remoteness of the time. I have said that J. Q. Adams died in February, 1848. Carried back with much funereal state from the Capitol at Washington to Massachusetts, he was in March buried at Quincy. An eloquent discourse was then delivered over his grave by the minister of the church of which the ex-President had been a member. He who delivered it was a scholar, as well as a natural orator of high order; and, in the course of what he said he had occasion to refer to this remote region, then not yet admitted

to statehood, and he did so under the name of "the Ouisconsin." That discourse was delivered on the 11th of March, 1848; and, on the 29th of the following May, Wisconsin became a State.

Returning now to the presidential election of 1848, it will be found that Wisconsin, the youngest community in the Union, came at once to the front as the banner state of the West in support of the principles on which the Union was established, and the maintenance and vindication of those fundamental principles within the Union and through the Constitution. In that canvass the great issues of the future were distinctly brought to the front. The old party organizations then still confronted each other,—the Henry Clay Whigs were over against the Jacksonian Democracy; but in that election Lewis Cass, the legitimate candidate of the Democracy,—a Northern man with Southern principles,—so far as African slavery was concerned a distinct reactionist from the principles of the great Declaration of 1776,—Lewis Cass, of Michigan, was opposed to General Zachary Taylor, of Louisiana, himself a slaveholder, and nominated by a party which in presenting his name carefully abstained from any enunciation of political principles. He was an unknown political quantity; and no less a public character than Daniel Webster characterized his nomination as one not fit to be made. It yet remained to be seen that, practically, the plain, blunt, honest, well-meaning old soldier made an excellent President, whose premature loss was deeply and with reason deplored. His nomination, however, immediately after that of Cass, proved the signal for revolt. For the disciples of J. Q. Adams in both political camps it was as if the cry had again gone forth, "To your tents, O Israel!"—and a first fierce blast of the coming storm then swept across the land. In August the dissentients met in conference at Buffalo, and there first enunciated the principles of the American political party of the future,—that party which, permeated by the sentiment of Nationality, was destined to do away with slavery through the war power, and to incorporate into the Constitution the principle of the equality of man before the law, irrespective of color or of race. Now, more than half a century after the event, it may fairly be said of those concerned in the Buffalo movement of 1848 that they were destined to earn in the fulness of time the rare distinction of carrying mankind forward one distinct stage in the long process of evolution. In support of that movement Wisconsin was, as I have already said, the banner western state. In its action it simply responded to its early impulse received from New England and western New York. Thus the seed fell in fertile places and produced fruit an hundred fold. The law of natural selection, though not yet formulated, was at work.

The election returns of 1848 tell the story. They are still eloquent. The heart of the movement of that year lay in Massachusetts and Vermont. In those two states, taken together, the party of the future polled, in 1848, a little over 28 per cent. of the aggregate vote cast. In Wisconsin it polled close upon 27 per cent.; and this 27 per cent. in Wisconsin is to be compared with 15 per cent. in Michigan, 12 per cent. in Illinois, less than 11 per cent. in Ohio, and not 4 per cent. in the adjoining state of Iowa. In the three neighboring states of Michigan, Illinois and Iowa, taken together, the new movement gathered into itself 12 per cent. of the total voting constituency, while in Wisconsin it counted, as I have said, over 26 per cent. Thus, in 1848, Wisconsin was the Vermont of the West; sending to Congress as one of its three representatives Charles Durkee, a son of Vermont, the first distinctively anti-slavery man from the Northwest. Wisconsin remained the Vermont of the West. From its very origin not the smallest doubt attached to its attitude. It emphasized it in words when in 1849 it instructed one of its senators at Washington "to immediately resign his seat" because he had "outraged the feelings of the people" by dalliance with the demands of the slave power; it emphasized it by action when five years later its highest judicial tribunal did not hesitate to declare the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 "unconstitutional and void." At the momentous election of 1860, Wisconsin threw 56 per cent. of its vote in favor of the ticket bearing the name of Abraham Lincoln; nor did the convictions of the state weaken under the test of war. In 1864, when Wisconsin had sent into the field over 90,000 enlisted men to maintain the Union, and to make effective the most extreme doctrine of war powers under the Constitution,—even then, in the fourth year of severest stress, Wisconsin again threw 55 per cent. of its popular vote for the re-election of Lincoln. A year later the struggle ended. Throughout the ordeal Wisconsin never faltered.

Of the record made by Wisconsin in the Civil War, I am not here to speak. That field has been sufficiently covered, and covered by those far better qualified than I to work in it. I will only say, in often quoted words, that none then died more reely or in greater glory than those Wisconsin sent into the field, though then many died, and there was much glory. When figures so speak, comment weakens. Look at the record:—Fifty-seven regiments and thirteen batteries in the field; a death-roll exceeding 12,000; a Wisconsin regiment (2d) first in that roll of honor which tells off the regiments of the Union which suffered most, and two other Wisconsin regiments (7th and 26th), together, fifth; while a brigade made up three-

quarters of Wisconsin battalions shows the heaviest aggregate loss sustained during the war by any similar command, and is hence known in the history of the struggle as the "Iron Brigade." Thirteen Wisconsin regiments participated in Grant's brilliant movement on Vicksburg; five were with Thomas at Chickamauga; seven with Sherman at Mission Ridge; and, finally, eleven marched with him to the sea, while four remained behind to strike with Thomas at Nashville. Thus it may truly be said that wherever, between the 13th of April, 1861, and the 26th of April, 1865, death was reaping its heaviest harvest,—whether in Pennsylvania, in Virginia, in Tennessee, in Mississippi, in Georgia,—at Shiloh, at Corinth, at Antietam, at Gettysburg, in the salient at Spottsylvania, in the death-trap at Petersburg, or in the Peninsula slaughter-pen,—wherever during those awful years the dead lay thickest, there the men from Wisconsin were freely laying down their lives.

It is, however, no part of my present purpose to set forth here your sacrifices in the contest of 1861–65. What I have undertaken to do is to assign to Wisconsin its proper and relative place as a factor in one of the great evolutionary movements of man. As the twig was bent, the tree inclined. The sacrifices of Wisconsin life and treasure between 1861 and 1865 were but the fulfilment of the promise given by Wisconsin in 1848. The state, it is true, at no time during that momentous struggle rose to a position of unchallenged leadership either in the field or the council chamber. Among its representatives it did not number a Lincoln or a Sherman; but it did supply in marked degree that greatest and most necessary of all essentials in every evolutionary crisis, a well-developed and thoroughly distributed popular backbone.

This racial characteristic, also, I take to be the one great essential to the success of our American experiment. In every emergency which arises there is always the cry raised for a strong hand at the helm,—the ship of state is invariably declared to be hopelessly drifting. But it is in just those times of crisis that a widely diffused individuality proves the greatest possible safeguard,—the only reliable public safeguard. It is then with the state as it is with a strong, seaworthy ship manned by a hardy and experienced crew, in no way dependent on the one pilot who may chance to be at the wheel. In any stress of storm, the ship's company will prove equal to the occasion, and somehow provide for its own salvation. Under similar political conditions a community asserts, in the long run, its superiority to the accidents of fortune,—the aberrations due to the influence of individual genius, those winning numbers in the lottery of fate,—and evinces that staying power, which, no less now and

here than in Rome and Great Britain, is the only safe rock of empire. The race thus educated and endowed is the masterful race,—the master of its own destiny, it is master of the destiny of others ; and of that crowning republican quality, Wisconsin, during our period of national trial, showed herself markedly possessed. While individuals were not exceptional, the average was unmistakably high.

And this I hold to be the highest tribute which can be paid to a political community. It implies all else. Unless I greatly err, this characteristic has, in the case of Wisconsin, a profound and scientific significance of the most far-reaching character ; and so I find myself brought back to my text. As I have already more than once said, others are in every way better qualified than I to speak intelligently of the Wisconsin stock,—of the elements which enter into the brain and bone and sinew of the race now holding as its abiding-place and breeding-ground the region lying between Lake Michigan and the waters of the upper Mississippi,—between the state of Illinois on the south and Lake Superior on the north. I speak chiefly from impression, and always subject to correction ; but my understanding is that this region was in the main peopled by men and women representing in their persons what there was of the more enterprising, adventurous and energetic of three of the most thoroughly virile and, withal, moral and intellectual branches of the human family,—I refer to the Anglo-Saxon of New England descent, and to the Teutonic and the Scandinavian families. Tough of fibre and tenacious of principle, the mixed descendants from those races were well calculated to illustrate the operation of a natural law ; and I have quite failed in my purpose if I have not improved this occasion to point out how in the outset of their political life as a community they illustrated the force of Stoughton's utterance and the truth of Darwin's remarkable generalization. By their attitude and action, at once intelligent and decided, they left their imprint on that particular phase of human evolution which then presented itself. They, in so doing, assigned to Wisconsin its special place and work in the great scheme of development, and forecast its mission in the future.

I have propounded an historical theory ; it is for others, better advised, having passed upon it, to confirm or reject.

There are many other topics which might here and now be discussed, perhaps advantageously,—topics closely connected with this edifice and with the occasion,—topics relating to libraries, the accumulation of historical material, and methods of work in connection with it ; but space and time alike forbid. A selection must be

made, and, in making my selection, I go back to the fact that, representing one historical society, I am here at the behest of another historical society; and matters relating to what we call "history" are, therefore, those most germane to the day. Coming, then, here from the East to a point which, in the great future of our American development,—a century, or, perchance, two or three centuries hence,—may not unreasonably look forward to being the seat of other methods and a higher learning, I propose to pass over the more obvious, and, possibly, the more useful, even if more modest, subjects of discussion, and to try my hand at one which, even if it challenges controversy, is indisputably suggestive. I refer to certain of the more marked of those tendencies which characterize the historical work of the day. Having dealt with the sifted grain, I naturally come to speak of those who have told the tale of the sifting. Looking back, from the standpoint of 1900, over the harvested sheaves which stud the fields we have traversed, the retrospect is not to me altogether satisfactory. In fact, taken as a whole, our histories—I speak of those written by the dead only—have not, I submit, so far as we are concerned, fully met the requirements of time and place. Literary masterpieces, scientific treatises, philosophical disquisitions, sometimes one element predominates, sometimes another; but in them all something is wanting. That something I take to be an adequately developed literary sense.

In dealing with this subject, I am well aware my criticism might take a wider range. I need not confine myself to history, inasmuch as, in the matter of literary sense, the shortcomings, or the excesses, rather, of the American writer are manifest. In the Greek, and in the Greek alone, this sense seems to have been instinctive. He revealed it, and he revealed it at once, in poetry, in architecture and in art, as he revealed it in the composition of history. Of Homer we cannot speak; but Herodotus and Phidias died within six years of each other, each a father in his calling. With us Americans that intuitive literary sense, resulting in the perfection of literary form seems not less conspicuous for its absence than it was conspicuous for its presence among the Greeks. In literature the American seems to exist in a medium of stenographers and typewriters, and with a public printer at his beck and call. To such a degree is this the case that the expression I have just used—literary form—has, to many, and those not the least cultured, ceased to carry a meaning. Literary form they take to mean what they know as style; while style is, with them, but another term for word-painting. Accordingly, with altogether too many of our American writers, to be voluminous and verbose is to be great. They would

conquer by force of numbers—the number of words they use. I, the other day, chanced across a curious illustration of this in the diary of my father. Returning from his long residence in England at the time of the Civil War, he attended some ceremonies held in Boston in honor of a public character who had died shortly before. "The eulogy," he wrote, "was good, but altogether too long. There is in all the American style of composition a tendency to diffuseness, and the repetition of the same ideas, which materially impairs the force of what is said. I see it the more clearly from having been so long out of the atmosphere."

The failing is national; nor in this respect does the American seem to profit by experience. Take, for instance, the most important of our public documents, the inaugurations of our Presidents. We are a busy people; yet our newly elected Presidents regularly inflict on us small volumes of information, and this, too, notwithstanding the fact that in the long line of inaugural common-places but one utterance stands out in memory, and that one the shortest of all,—the immortal second of Lincoln. Our present chief magistrate found himself unable to do justice to the occasion, in his last annual message, in less than eighteen thousand words; and in the Congress to which this message was addressed, two senators, in discussing the "paramount" issue of the day, did so, the one in a speech of sixty-five thousand words, the other in a speech of fifty-five thousand. Webster replied to Hayne in thirty-five thousand; and Webster then did not err on the side of brevity. So in the presidential canvass now in progress. Mr. Bryan accepted his nomination in a comparatively brief speech of nine thousand words; and this speech was followed by a letter of five thousand, covering omissions because of previous brevity. President McKinley, in his turn, then accepted a renomination in a letter of twelve thousand words,—a letter actually terse when compared with his last annual message; but which Mr. Carl Schurz subsequently proceeded to comment on in a vigorous address of fourteen thousand words. Leviathans in language, we Americans need to be Methuselahs in years. It was not always so. The contrast is, indeed, noticeable. Washington's first inaugural numbered twenty-three hundred words. Including that now in progress, my memory covers fourteen presidential canvasses; and by far the most generally applauded and effective letter of acceptance put forth by any candidate during all those canvasses was that of General Grant in 1868. Including address and signature, it was comprised in exactly two hundred and thirty words. With a brevity truly commendable, even if military, he used one word where his civilian

successor found occasion for fifty-two. As to the opponent of that civilian successor, he sets computation at defiance. Indeed, speaking of Mr. Bryan purely from the historical standpoint, I seriously doubt whether, in all human experience, any man ever before gave utterance to an equal number of words in the same space of time.

Leaving illustration, however, and returning to my theme, I will now say that in the whole long and memorable list of distinctively American literary men,—authors, orators, poets and story-tellers,—I recall but three who seem to me to have been endowed with a sense of form, at once innate and Greek; those three were Daniel Webster, Edgar Allan Poe and Nathaniel Hawthorne. Yet, unless moulded by that instinctive sense of form, nothing can be permanent in literature any more than in sculpture, in painting or in architecture. Not size, nor solidity, nor fidelity of work, nor knowledge of detail will preserve the printed volume any more than they will preserve the canvass or the edifice; and this I hold to be just as true of history as of the oration, the poem or the drama.

Surely, then, our histories need not all, of necessity, be designed for students and scholars exclusively; and yet it is a noteworthy fact that even to-day, after scholars and story-tellers have been steadily at work upon it for nearly a century and a half,—ever since David Hume and Oliver Goldsmith brought forth their classic renderings,—the chief popular knowledge of over three centuries of English history between John Plantagenet (1200) and Elizabeth Tudor (1536) is derived from the pages of Shakespeare. There is also a curious theory now apparently in vogue in our university circles, that, in some inscrutable way, accuracy as to fact and a judicial temperament are inconsistent with a highly developed literary sense. Erudition and fairness are the qualities in vogue, while form and brilliancy are viewed askance. Addressing now an assembly made up, to an unusual extent, of those engaged in the work of instruction in history, I wish to suggest that this marked tendency of the day is in itself a passing fashion, and merely a reactionary movement against the influence of two great literary masters of the last generation,—Macaulay and Carlyle. That the reaction had reason, I would by no means deny; but, like most decided reactions, has it not gone too far? Because men weary of brilliant colors, and mere imitators try to wield the master's brush, it by no means follows that art does not find its highest expression in Titian and Tintoretto, Rembrandt, Claude and Turner. It is the same with history. Profound scholars, patient investigators, men of a judicial turn of mind, subtle philosophers and accurate annalists empty forth upon a patient, because somewhat indifferent, read-

ing public volume after volume ; but the great masters of literary form, in history as in poetry, alone retain their hold. Thucydides, Tacitus and Gibbon are always there, on a level with the eye ; while those of their would-be successors who find themselves unable to tell us what they know, in a way in which we care to hear it, or within limits consistent with human life, are quietly relegated to the oblivion of the topmost shelf.

I fear that I am myself in danger of sinning somewhat flagrantly against the canons I have laid down. Exceeding my allotted space, I am conscious of disregarding any correct rule of form by my attempt at dealing with more subjects than it is possible on one occasion adequately to discuss. None the less I cannot resist the temptation,—I am proving myself an American ; and having gone thus far, I will now go on to the end, even though alone. There are, I hold, three elements which enter into the make-up of the ideal historian, whether him of the past or him of the future ;—these three are learning, judgment and the literary sense. A perfect history, like a perfect poem, must have a beginning, a middle and an end ; and the well proportioned parts should be kept in strict subservience to the whole. The dress, also, should be in keeping with the substance ; and both subordinated to the conception. Attempting no display of erudition, pass the great historical literatures and names in rapid review, and see in how few instances all these canons were observed. And first, the Hebrew. While the Jew certainly was not endowed with the Greek's sense of form in sculpture, in painting or in architecture, in poetry and music he was, and has since been, pre-eminent. His philosophy and his history found their natural expression through his aptitudes. The result illustrates the supreme intellectual power exercised by art. Of learning and judgment there is only pretense ; but imagination and power are there : and, even to this day, the Hebrew historical writings are a distinct literature,—we call them "The Sacred Books." We have passed from under that superstition ; and yet it still holds a traditional sway. The books of Moses are merely a first tentative effort on the road subsequently trodden by Herodotus, Livy and Voltaire ; but their author was so instinct with imagination and such a master of form that to this day his narrative is read and accepted as history by more human beings than are all the other historical works in existence combined in one mass. No scholar or man of reflection now believes that Moses was any more inspired than Homer, Julius Caesar or Thomas Carlyle ; but the imagination and intellectual force of the man, combined with his instinct for literary form, sufficed to secure for what he wrote a unique mastery only in our day shaken.

The Greek follows hard upon the Jew ; and of the Greek I have already said enough. He had a natural sense of art in all its shapes ; and, when it came to writing history, Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon seemed mere evolutions. Of the three, Thucydides alone combined in perfection the qualities of erudition, judgment and form ; but to the last-named element, their literary form, it is that all three owe their immortality.

It is the same with the Romans—Livy, Sallust, Tacitus. The Roman had not that artistic instinct so noticeable in the Greek. He was, on the contrary, essentially a soldier, a ruler and organizer ; and a literary imitator. Yet now and again even in art he attained a proficiency which challenged his models. Cicero has held his own with Demosthenes ; and Virgil, Horace and Juvenal survive, each through a mastery of form. Tacitus, it is needless to say, is the Latin Thucydides. In him again, five centuries after Thucydides, the three essentials are combined in the highest degree. The orbs of the great historical constellation are wide apart,—the interval that divided Tacitus from Thucydides is the same as that which divided Matthew Paris from Edward Gibbon ;—twice that which divides Shakespeare from Tennyson.

Coming rapidly down to modern times, of the three great languages fruitful in historical work,—the French, English and German,—those writing in the first have alone approached the aptitude for form natural to the Greeks ; but in Gibbon only of those who have, in the three tongues, devoted themselves to historical work, were all the cardinal elements of historical greatness found united in such a degree as to command general assent to his pre-eminence. The Germans are remarkable for erudition, and have won respect for their judgment ; but their disregard of form has been innate,—indicative either of a lack of perception or of contempt.¹ Their work accordingly will hardly prove enduring. The French, from Voltaire down, have evinced a keener perception of form, nor have they been lacking in erudition. Critical and quick to perceive, they have still failed in any one instance to combine the three great attributes each in its highest degree. Accordingly, in the historical firmament they count no star of the first magnitude. Their lights have been meteoric rather than permanent.

In the case of Great Britain it is interesting to follow the familiar

¹ “ Not only does a German writer possess, as a rule, a full measure of the patient industry which is required for thinking everything that may be thought about his theme, and knowing what others have thought ; he alone, it seems, when he comes to write a book about it, is imbued with the belief that that book ought necessarily to be a complete compendium of everything that has been so thought, whether by himself or others.” *The Athenaeum*, September 8, 1900, p. 303.

names, noting the shortcoming of each. The roll scarcely extends beyond the century,—Hume, Robertson and Gibbon constituting the solitary remembered exceptions. Of Gibbon, I have already spoken. He combined in highest degree all the elements of the historian,—in as great a degree as Thucydides or Tacitus. He was an orb of the first order; and it was his misfortune that he was born and wrote before Darwin gave to history unity and a scheme. Hume was a subtle philosopher, and his instinctive mastery of form has alone caused his history to survive. He was not an investigator in the modern sense of the term, nor was he gifted with an intuitive historical instinct. Robertson had fair judgment and a well-developed though in no way remarkable sense of form; but he lacked erudition, and, as compared with Gibbon, for example, was content to accept his knowledge at second hand. Telling his story well, he was never master of his subject.

Coming down to our own century, and speaking only of the dead, a series of familiar names at once suggest themselves,—Mitford, Grote and Thirlwall; Arnold and Merivale; Milman, Lingard, Hallam, Macaulay, Carlyle, Buckle, Froude, Freeman and Green,—naming only the more conspicuous. Mitford was no historian at all; merely an historical pamphleteer. His judgment was inferior to his erudition even, and he had no sense of form. Grote was erudite, but he wrote in accordance with his political affinities, and what is called the spirit of the time and place; and that time and place were not Greece, nor the third and fourth centuries before Christ. He had, moreover, no sense of literary form, for he put what he knew into twelve volumes, when human patience did not suffice for six. Thirlwall was erudite in a way, and a thinker and writer of unquestionable force; but his work on Greece was written to order, and is what is known as a "standard history." Correct, but devoid of inspiration, it is slightly suggestive of a second-class epic. Arnold is typical of scholarship and insight; his judgment is excellent; but of literary art, so conspicuous in his son, there is no trace. Merivale is scholarly and academic. Milman was hampered by his church training, which fettered his judgment; learned, as learning went in those days, there is in his writings nothing that would attract readers or students of a period later than his own. Lingard was another church historian. A correct writer, he tells England's story from the point of view of Rome. Hallam is deeply read, and judicial; but the literary sense is conspicuously absent. His volumes are well-nigh unreadable. Freeman is the typical modern historian of the original-material-and-monograph school. He writes irrespective of the readers. Learned beyond

compare, he cumbers the shelves of our libraries with an accumulation of volumes which are not literature.

Of Henry Thomas Buckle and of John Richard Green I will speak together, and with respectful admiration. Both were prematurely cut off, almost in what with historical writers is the period of promise; for, while Green at the time of his death was forty-seven, Buckle was not yet forty-one. What they did, therefore,—and they both did much,—was indicative only of what they might have done. Judged by that,—*ex pede Herculem*,—I hold that they come nearer to the ideal of what a twentieth-century historian should be than any other writers in our modern English tongue. That Buckle was crude, impulsive, hasty in generalization and paradoxical in judgment is not to be gainsaid; but he wrote before Darwin; and, when he published his history, he was but thirty-six. What might he not have become had he been favored with health, and lived to sixty! Very different in organization, he and Green alike possessed in high degree the spirit of investigation and the historical insight, combined with a well-developed literary sense. Men of untiring research, they had the faculty of expression. Artists as well as scholars, they inspired. Their early death was in my judgment an irreparable loss to English historical lore and the best historical treatment.

I come now to Macaulay, Carlyle and Froude, the three literary masters of the century who have dealt with history in the English tongue; and I shall treat of them briefly, and in the inverse order. Froude is redeemed by a sense of literary form; as an historian he was learned, but inaccurate, and his judgment was fatally defective. He was essentially an artist. Carlyle was a poet rather than an historian. A student, with the insight of a seer and a prophet's voice, his judgment was fatally biassed. A wonderful master of form, his writings will endure; but rather as epics in prose than as historical monuments. Macaulay came, in my judgment, nearer than any other English writer of the century to the great historical stature; but he failed to attain it. The cause of his failure is an instructive as well as an interesting study.

Thomas Babington Macaulay is unquestionably the most popular historian that ever wrote. His history, when it appeared, was the literary sensation of the day, and its circulation increased with each succeeding volume. Among historical works, it alone has in its vogue thrown into the shade the most successful novels of the century,—those of Scott, Thackeray and Dickens, *Jane Eyre*, *Robert Elsmere*, and even *Richard Carvel*, the last ephemeral sensation; but, of the three great attributes of the historian, Macaulay was endowed with only one. He was a man of vast erudition; and,

moreover, he was gifted with a phenomenal memory, which seemed to put at his immediate disposal the entire accumulation of his omnivorous reading. His judgment was, however, defective; for he was, from the very ardor of his nature,¹ more or less of a partisan, while the wealth of his imagination and the exuberance of his rhetoric were fatal to his sense of form. He was incomparably the greatest of historical *raconteurs*, but the fascination of the story overcame his sense of proportion, and he was buried under his own riches. For it is a great mistake to suppose, as so many do, that what is called style, no matter how brilliant, or how correct and clear, constitutes in itself literary form; it is a large and indispensable element in literary form, but neither the whole, nor indeed the greatest part of it. The entire scheme, the proportion of the several parts to the whole and to each other, the grouping and the presentation, the background and the accessories constitute literary form; the style of the author is merely the drapery of presentation. Here was where Macaulay failed; and he failed on a point which the average historical writer, and the average historical instructor still more, does not as a rule even take into consideration. Macaulay's general conception of his scheme was so imperfect as to be practically impossible; and this he himself, when too late, sadly recognized. His interest in his subject and the warmth of his imagination swept him away,—they were too strong for his sense of proportion. Take, for instance, two such wonderful bits as his account of the trial of the seven bishops, and his narrative of the siege of Londonderry. They are masterpieces; but they should be monographs. They are in their imagery and detail out of all proportion to any general historical plan. They imply a whole which would be in itself an historical library rather than a history. On the matter of judgment it is not necessary to dwell. Macaulay's work is unquestionably history, and history on a panoramic scale; but the pigments he used are indisputably Whig. Yet his method was instinctively correct. He had his models and his scheme,—he made his preliminary studies,—he saw his subject as a whole, and in its several parts; but he labored under two disadvantages:—in the first place, like Gibbon, he was born and wrote before the discoveries of Darwin had

¹ "It is well to realize that this greatest history of modern times was written by one in whom a distrust in enthusiasm was deeply rooted. This cynicism was not inconsistent with partiality, with definite prepossessions, with a certain spite. The conviction that enthusiasm is inconsistent with intellectual balance was engrained in his mental constitution, and confirmed by study and experience. It might be reasonably maintained that zeal for men or causes is an historian's undoing, and that 'reserve sympathy'—the principle of Thucydides—is the first lesson he has to learn." J. B. Bury, Introduction to his edition (1896) of Gibbon, I. lxvii.-lxviii.

given its whole great unity to history ; and, in the second place, he had not thought his plan fully out, subordinating severely to it both his imagination and his rhetoric. Accordingly, so far as literary form was concerned, his history, which in that respect above all should, with his classic training, have been an entire and perfect chrysolite, was in fact a monumental failure. It was not even a whole ; it was only a fragment.

Coming now to our own American experience, and still speaking exclusively of the writings of the dead, it is not unsafe to say that there is as yet no American historical work which can call even for mention among those of the first class. The list can speedily be passed in review,—Marshall, Irving, Prescott, Hildreth, Bancroft, Motley, Palfrey and Parkman. Except those yet living, I do not recall any others who would challenge consideration. That Marshall was endowed with a calm, clear judgment, no reader of his judicial opinions would deny ; but he had no other attribute of an historian. He certainly was not historically learned, and there is no evidence that he was gifted with any sense of literary proportion. Irving was a born man of letters. With a charming style and a keen sense of humor, he was as an historical writer defective in judgment. Not a profound or accurate investigator, as became apparent in his *Columbus* and his *Washington*, his excellent natural literary sense was but partially developed. Perhaps he was born before his time ; perhaps his education did not lead him to the study of the best models ; but, however it came about, he failed, and failed indisputably, in form. Prescott was a species of historical pioneer,—an adventurer in a new field of research and of letters. Not only was he, like Macaulay and the rest, born before Darwin and the other great scientific lights of the century had assigned to human history its unity, limits and significance, but Prescott was not a profound scholar, nor yet a thorough investigator ; his judgment was by no means either incisive or robust, and his style was elegant, as the phrase goes, rather than tersely vigorous. He wrote, moreover, of that which he never saw, or made himself thoroughly part of even in imagination. Laboring under great disadvantages, his course was infinitely creditable ; but his portrait in the gallery of historians is not on the eye line. Of Hildreth, it is hardly necessary to speak. Laborious and persevering, his investigation was not thorough ; indeed he had not taken in the fundamental conditions of modern historical research. With a fatally defective judgment, he did not know what form was.

George Bancroft was in certain ways unique, and, among writers and students, his name cannot be mentioned without respect. He

was by nature an investigator. His learning and philosophy cannot be called sound, and his earlier manner was something to be forever avoided: but he was indefatigable as a collector, and his patience knew no bounds. He devoted his life to his subject; and his life came to a close while he was still dwelling on the preliminaries to his theme. A partisan, and writing in support of a pre-conceived theory, his judgment was necessarily biased; while, as respects literary form, though he always tended to what was better, he never even approximately reached what is best. He, too, like Macaulay, failed to grasp the wide and fundamental distinction between a proportioned and complete history and a thorough historical monograph. His monumental work, therefore, is neither the one nor the other. As a collection of monographs, it is too condensed and imperfect; as a history, it is cumbersome, and enters into unnecessary detail.

From a literary point of view Motley is unquestionably the most brilliant of American historical writers. He reminds the reader of Froude. Not naturally a patient or profound investigator, he yet forced himself to make a thorough study of his great subject, and he was gifted with a remarkable descriptive power. A man of intense personality, he was, however, defective in judgment, if not devoid of the faculty. He lacked calmness and method. He could describe a siege or a battle with a vividness which, while it revealed the master, revealed also the historian's limitations. With a distinct sense of literary form, he was unable to resist the temptations of imagination and sympathy. His taste was not severe; his temper the reverse of serene. His defects as an historian were consequently as apparent as are his merits as a writer.

Of Palfrey, the historian, I would speak with the deep personal respect I entertained for the man. A typical New Englander, a victim almost of that "terrible New England conscience," he wrote the history of New England. A scholar in his way and the most patient of investigators, he had, as an historian, been brought up in a radically-wrong school, that of New England theology. There was in him not a trace of the skeptic; not a suggestion of the humorist or easy-going philosopher. He wrote of New England from the inside and in close sympathy with it. Thus, as respects learning, care and accuracy, he was in no way deficient, while he was painstaking and conscientious in the extreme. His training and mental characteristics, however, impaired his judgment, and he was quite devoid of any sense of form. The investigator will always have recourse to his work; but, as a guide, its value will pass

away with the traditions of the New England theological period. From the literary point of view the absence of all idea of proportion renders the bulk of what he wrote impossible for the reader.

Of those I have mentioned, Parkman alone remains ; perhaps the most individual of all our American historians, the one tasting most racy of the soil. Parkman did what Prescott failed to do, what it was not in Prescott ever to do. He wrote from the basis of a personal knowledge of the localities in which what he had to narrate occurred, and the characteristics of those with whom he undertook to deal. To his theme he devoted his entire life, working under difficulties even greater than those which so cruelly hampered Prescott. His patience under suffering was infinite ; his research was indefatigable. In this respect, he left nothing to be desired. While his historical judgment was better than his literary taste, his appreciation of form was radically defective. Indeed he seemed almost devoid of any true sense of proportion. The result is that he has left behind him a succession of monographs of more or less historical value or literary interest, but no complete, thoroughly designed and carefully proportioned historical unit. Like all the others, his work lacks form and finish.

The historical writers of more than an hundred years have thus been passed in hasty review, nor has any nineteenth-century compeer of Thucydides, Tacitus and Gibbon been found among those who have expressed themselves in the English tongue. Nor do I think that any such could be found in other tongues ; unless, perchance, among the Germans, Theodor Mommsen might challenge consideration. Of Mommsen's learning there can be no question. I do not think there can be much of his insight and judgment. The sole question would be as to his literary form ; nor, in that respect, judging by the recollection of thirty years, do I think that, so far as his history of Rome is concerned, judgment can be lightly passed against him. But, on this point, the verdict of time only is final. Before that verdict is in his case rendered, another half-century of probation must elapse.¹

¹ "C'est sous ces deux aspects—qui sont en réalité les deux faces de l'esprit de Mommsen, le savant et le politique—qu'il convient d'étudier cet ouvrage.

"Dans l'exposé scientifique de l'*Histoire Romaine* on ne sait ce qu'on doit le plus admirer, ou de la science colossale de l'auteur ou de l'art avec laquelle elle est mise en œuvre.

"C'était une entreprise colossale que celle de résumer tous les travaux sur la matière depuis Niebuhr. Mommsen lui-même avait contribué à ce travail par la quantité fabuleuse de mémoires qu'il avait écrits sur les points les plus spéciaux du droit romain, de l'archéologie ou de l'histoire. Or tout cela est assimilé d'une manière merveilleuse dans une narration historique qui est un des chefs-d'œuvre de l'histoire. L'histoire romaine est une œuvre extraordinaire dans sa condensation, comme il n'en existe nulle

There is still something to be taken into consideration. I have as yet dealt only with the writers ; the readers remain. During the century now ending, what changes have here come about ? For one, I frankly confess myself a strong advocate of what is sometimes rather contemptuously referred to as the popularization of history. I have but a limited sympathy with those who, from the etherealized atmosphere of the cloister, whether monkish or collegiate, seek truth's essence and pure learning only, regardless of utility, of sympathy or of applause. The great historical writer, fully to accomplish his mission, must, I hold, be in very close touch with the generation he addresses. In other words, to do its most useful work, historical thought must be made to permeate what we are pleased to call the mass ; it must be infiltrated through that great body of the community which, moving slowly and subject to all sorts of influences, in the end shapes national destinies. The true historian,—he who most sympathetically, as well as correctly, reads to the present the lessons to be derived from the experience of the past,—I hold to be the only latter-day prophet. That man has a message to deliver ; but, to deliver it effectively, he must, like every successful preacher, understand his audience ; and, to understand it, he must either be instinctively in sympathy with it, or he must have made a study of it. Of those instinctively in sympathy, I do not speak. That constitutes genius, and genius is a law unto itself ; but I do maintain that instructors in history and historical writers who ignore the prevailing literary and educational conditions, therein make a great mistake. He fails fatally who fails to conform to his environment ; and this is no less true of the historian than of the novelist or politician.

In other words, what have we to say of those who read ? What do we know of them ? Not much, I fancy. In spite of our public libraries, and in spite of the immensely increased diffusion of printed

autre au monde, enfermant dans des dimensions si restreintes (3 volumes in 8°) tant de choses et de si bonnes choses. Mommsen raconte d'une manière si attrayante que dès les premières lignes vous êtes entraîné. Ses grands tableaux sur les premières migrations des peuples en Italie, sur les débuts de Rome, sur les Etrusques, sur la domination des Hellènes en Italie ; ses chapitres sur les institutions romaines, le droit, la religion, l'armée et l'art ; sur la vie économique, l'agriculture, l'industrie et le commerce ; sur le développement intérieur de la politique romaine ; sur les Celtes et sur Carthage ; sur les péripéties de la Révolution romaine depuis les Gracques à Jules César ; sur l'Orient grec, la Macédoine ; sur la soumission de la Gaule : tout cela forme un ensemble admirable.

“Comme peintre de grands tableaux historiques, je ne vois parmi les historiens contemporains qu'un homme qui puisse être comparé à Mommsen, c'est Ernest Renan : c'est la même touche large, le même sens des proportions, le même art de faire voir et de faire comprendre, de rendre vivantes les choses par les détails typiques qui se gravent pour toujours dans la mémoire.” Guiland, *L'Allemagne Nouvelle et ses Historiens* (1900), pp. 121-122.

matter through the agency of those libraries and of the press, what those who compose the great mass of the community are reading, what enters into their intellectual nutriment, and thence passes into the secretions of the body politic,—this, I imagine, is a subject chiefly of surmise. The field is one upon which I do not now propose to enter. Too large, it is also a pathless wilderness. I would, however, earnestly commend it to some more competent treatment at an early convention of librarians or publishers. To-day we must confine ourselves to history. For what, in the way of history, is the demand? Who are at present the popular historical writers? How can the lessons of the past be most readily and most effectually brought home to the mind and thoughts of the great reading public, vastly greater and more intelligent now than ever before?

This is something upon which the census throws no light. There is a widespread impression among those more or less qualified to form an opinion that the general capacity for sustained reading and thinking has not increased or been strengthened with the passage of the years. On the contrary, the indications, it is currently supposed, are rather of emasculation. Everything must now be made easy and short. There is a constant demand felt, especially by our periodical press, for information on all sorts of subjects,—historical, philosophical, scientific,—but it must be set forth in what is known as a popular style, that is, introduced into the reader in a species of sugared capsule, and without leaving any annoying taste on the intellectual palate. The average reader, it is said, wants to know something concerning all the topics of the day; but, while it is highly desirable he should be gratified in this laudable, though languid, craving, he must not be fatigued in the effort of acquisition, and he will not submit to be bored. It is then further argued that this was not the case formerly; that in what are commonly alluded to as "the good old times,"—always the times of the grandparents,—people had fewer books, and fewer people read; but those who did read, deterred neither by number of pages nor by dryness of treatment, were equal to the feat of reading. To-day, on the contrary, almost no one rises to more than a magazine article; a volume appalls.

This is an extremely interesting subject of inquiry, were the real facts only attainable. Unfortunately they are not. We are forced to deal with impressions; and impressions, always vague, are usually deceptive. At the same time, when glimpses of a more or less remote past do now and again reach us, they seem to indicate mental conditions calculated to excite our special wonder. We do know, for instance, that in the olden days,—before public libraries and peri-

odicals, and the modern cheap press and the Sunday newspaper were devised,—when books were rarities, and reading a somewhat rare accomplishment,—the Bible, Shakespeare, *Paradise Lost*, the *Pilgrim's Progress*, and *Robinson Crusoe*, the *Spectator* and *Tatler*, Barrow's *Sermons* and Hume's *History of England* were the standard household and family literature; and the Bible was read and reread until its slightest allusions passed into familiar speech. Indeed the Bible, in King James's version, may be said to have been for the great mass of the community,—those who now have recourse to the Sunday paper,—the sum and substance of English literature. In this respect it is fairly open to question whether the course of evolution has tended altogether toward improvement. Now and again, however, we get one of these retrospective glimpses which is simply bewildering, and while indulging in it, one cannot help pondering over the mental conditions which once apparently prevailed. The question suggests itself, were there giants in those days?—or did the reader ask for bread, and did they give him a stone? We know, for instance, what the public library and circulating library of to-day are. We know, to a certain extent, what the reading demand is, and who the popular authors are. We know that, while history must content itself with a poor one in twenty, the call for works of fiction is more than a third of the whole, while nearly eighty per cent. of the ordinary circulation is made up of novels, story books for children, and periodicals. It is the lightest form of pabulum. This, in 1900. Now, let us get a glimpse of "the good old times."

In the year 1790, a humorous rascal named Burroughs—once widely known as "the notorious Stephen Burroughs"—found himself stranded in a town on Long Island, New York, a refugee from a Massachusetts gaol and whipping-post, the penalties incurred in or at both of which he had richly merited. In the place of his refuge, Burroughs served as the village schoolmaster; and, being of an observant turn of mind, he did not fail presently to note that the people of the place were "very illiterate," and almost entirely destitute of books of any kind, "except school books and bibles." Finding among the younger people of the community many "possessing bright abilities and a strong thirst for information," Burroughs asserts that he bestirred himself to secure the funds necessary to found the nucleus of a public library. Having in a measure succeeded, a meeting of "the proprietors" was called "for the purpose of selecting a catalogue of books;" and presently the different members presented lists "peculiar to their own tastes." Prior to this meeting it had been alleged that the people generally anticipated

that the books would be selected by the clergyman of the church, and would "consist of books of divinity, and dry metaphysical writings ; whereas, should they be assured that histories and books of information would be procured," they would have felt very differently. And now, when the lists were submitted, "Deacon Hodges brought forward 'Essays on the Divine Authority for Infant Baptism,' 'Terms of Church Communion,' 'The Careful Watchman,' 'Age of Grace,' etc. ; Deacon Cook's collection was 'History of Martyrs,' 'Rights of Conscience,' 'Modern Pharisees,' 'Defence of Separates ;' Mr. Woolworth exhibited 'Edwards against Chauncy,' 'History of Redemption,' 'Jennings's Views,' etc. ; Judge Hurlbut concurred in the same ; Dr. Rose exhibited 'Gay's Fables,' 'Pleasing Companion,' 'Turkish Spy,' while I," wrote Burroughs, "for the third time recommended 'Hume's History,' 'Voltaire's Histories,' 'Rollin's Ancient History,' 'Plutarch's Lives,' etc."

It would be difficult to mark more strikingly the development of a century, than by thus presenting Hume's History and Rollin as typical of what was deemed light and popular reading at one end of it, and the Sunday newspaper at the other. As I have already intimated, they were either giants in those days, or husks supplied milk for babes. Recurring, however, to present conditions, the popular demand for historical literature is undoubtedly vastly larger than it was a century ago ; nor is it by any means so clear as is usually assumed that the solid reading and thinking power of the community has at all deteriorated. That yet remains to be proved. A century ago, it is to be borne in mind, there were no public libraries at all, and the private collections of books were comparatively few and small. It is safe, probably, to assume that there are a hundred, or even a thousand, readers now to one then. On this head nothing even approximating to what would be deemed conclusive evidence is attainable ; but the fair assumption is that, while the light and ephemeral, knowledge-made-easy reading is a development of these latter years, it has in no way displaced the more sustained reading and severe thought of the earlier time. On the contrary, that also has had its share of increase. Take Gibbon, for instance. A few years ago, an acute and popular English critic, in speaking of the newly edited *Memoirs* of Gibbon, used this language :—"All readers of the *Decline and Fall*—that is to say, all men and women of a sound education," etc. If Mr. Frederic Harrison was correct in his generalization in 1896, certainly more could not have been said in 1796 ; and, during the intervening hundred years, the class of those who have received "a sound educa-

tion" has undergone a prodigious increase. Take Harvard College, for instance; in 1796 it graduated thirty-three students, and in 1896 it graduated four hundred and eight,—an increase of more than twelffold. In 1796, also, there were not a tenth part of the institutions of advanced education in the country which now exist. The statistics of the publishing houses and the shelves of the book-selling establishments all point to the same conclusion. Of course, it does not follow that because a book is bought it is also read; but it is not unsafe to say that twenty copies of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* are called for in the bookstores of to-day to one that was called for in 1800.

On this subject, however, very instructive light may be derived from another quarter. I refer to the public library. While discussing the question eighteen months ago, I ventured to state that, "in the case of one public library in a considerable Massachusetts city I had been led to conclude, as the result of examination and somewhat careful inquiry, that the copy of the *Decline and Fall* on its shelves had, in over thirty years, not once been consecutively read through by a single individual." I have since made further and more careful inquiry on this point from other, and larger, though similar institutions, and the inference I then drew has been confirmed and generalized. I have also sought information as to the demand for historical literature, and the tendency and character of the reading so far as it could be ascertained, or approximately inferred. I have submitted my list of historical writers, and inquired as to the call for them. Suggestive in all respects, the results have, in some, been little less than startling. Take for instance popularity, and let me recur to Macaulay and Carlyle. I have spoken of the two as great masters in historical composition,—comparing them in their field to Turner and Millet in the field of art. Like Turner and Millet, they influenced to a marked extent a whole generation of workers that ensued. To such an extent did they influence it that a scholastic reaction against them set in,—a reaction as distinct as it was strong. Nevertheless, in spite of that reaction, to what extent did the master retain his popular hold? I admit that my astonishment was great when I learned that between 1880, more than twenty years after his death, and 1900, besides innumerable editions issued on both sides of the Atlantic, the authorized London publishers of Macaulay had sold in two shapes only,—and they appear in many other shapes,—80,000 copies of his *History* and 90,000 of his *Miscellanies*. Of Carlyle and the call for his writings I could gather no such specific particulars; but in reply to my inquiries, I was generally advised that, while the English demand had been large,

there was no considerable American publishing house which had not brought out partial or complete editions of his works. They also were referred to as "innumerable."¹ In other words, when a generation that knew them not had passed away, the works of the two great masters of historical literary form in our day sold beyond all compare with the productions of any of the living writers most in vogue; and this while the professorial dry-as-dust reaction against those masters was in fullest swing.

With a vast amount of material unused, and much still unsaid, I propose, in concluding, to trespass still further on your patience while I draw a lesson to which the first portion of my discourse will contribute not less than the second. A great, as well as a very voluminous, recent historical writer has coined the apothegm,—"History is past politics, and politics are present History." The proposition is one I do not now propose to discuss, except to suggest that, however it may have been heretofore, what is known as politics will be but a part, and by no means the most important part, of the history of the future. The historian will look deeper. It was President Lincoln who said in one of the few immortal utterances of the century,—an utterance, be it also observed, limited to two hundred and fifty words,—that this our nation was "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal;" and that it was for us highly to resolve "that government of the people, by the people, for the people, should not perish from the earth." It was James Russell Lowell, who, when asked in Paris by the historian Guizot many years since, how long the Republic of the United States might reasonably be expected to endure, happily replied,—"So long as the ideas of its founders continue dominant." In the first place, I hold it not unsafe to say that, looking forward into a future not now remote, the mission of the Republic and the ideas of the founders will more especially rest in the hands of those agricultural communities of the Northwest, where great aggregations of a civic populace are few, and the principles of natural selection have had the fullest and the freest play in the formation of the race. Such is Wisconsin; such Iowa; such Minnesota. In their hands, and in the hands of communities like them, will rest the ark of our covenant.

¹ At least twenty (20) American publishing houses have brought out complete editions of Macaulay, both his *Miscellanies* and the *History of England*. Many of these editions have been expensive, and they seem uniformly to have met with a ready demand. Almost every American publishing house of any note has brought out editions of some of the *Essays*. The same is, to a less extent, true of Carlyle. Seven (7) houses have brought out complete editions of his works; while three (3) others have put on the market imported editions, bearing an American imprint. Separate editions of the more popular of his writings—some cheap, others *de luxe*—have been brought out by nearly every American publishing concern.

In the next place, for the use and future behoof of those communities I hold that the careful and intelligent reading of the historical lessons of the past is all important. Without that reading, and a constant emphasis laid upon its lessons, the nature of that mission and those ideas to which Lincoln and Lowell alluded cannot be kept fresh in mind. This institution I accordingly regard as the most precious of all Wisconsin's endowments of education. It should be the sheet-anchor by which, amid the storms and turbulence of a tempestuous future, the ship of state will be anchored to the firm holding-ground of tradition. It is to further this result that I to-day make appeal to the historian of the future. His, in this community, is a great and important mission; a mission which he will not fulfil unless he to a large extent frees himself from the trammels of the past, and rises to an equality with the occasion. He must be a prophet and a poet, as well as an investigator and an annalist. He must cut loose from many of the models and most of the precedents of the immediate past, and the educational precepts now so commonly in vogue. He must perplex the modern college professor by asserting that soundness is not always and of necessity dull, and that even intellectual sobriety may be carried to an excess. Not only is it possible for a writer to combine learning and accuracy with vivacity, but to be read and to be popular should not in the eyes of the judicious be a species of stigma. Historical research may, on the other hand, result in a mere lumber of learning; and, even in the portrayal of the sequence of events, it is to a man's credit that he should strive to see things from the point of view of an artist, rather than, looking with the dull eye of a mechanic, seek to measure them with the mechanic's twelve-inch rule. I confess myself weary of those reactionary influences amid which of late we have lived. I distinctly look back with regret to that more spiritual and more confident time when we of the generation now passing from the stage drew our inspiration from prophets, and not from laboratories. So to-day I make bold to maintain that the greatest benefactor America could have—far more immediately influential than any possible President or senator or peripatetic political practitioner, as well as infinitely more so in a remote future—would be some historical writer, occupying perhaps a chair here at Madison, who would in speech and book explain and expound, as they could be explained and expounded, the lessons of American history and the fundamental principles of American historical faith.

It was Macaulay who made his boast that, disregarding the traditions which constituted what he contemptuously termed "the dig-

nity of history," he would set forth England's story in so attractive a form that his volumes should displace the last novel from the work-table of the London society girl. And he did it. It is but the other day that an American naval officer suddenly appeared in the field of historical literature, and, by two volumes, sensibly modified the policy of nations. Here are precept and example. To accomplish similar results should, I hold, be the ambition of the American historian. Popularity he should court as a necessary means to an end ; and that he should attain popularity, he must study the art of presentation as much and as thoughtfully as he delves amid the original material of history. Becoming more of an artist, rhetorician and philosopher than he now is, he must be less of a pedant and colorless investigator. In a word, going back to Moses, Thucydides and Herodotus ; Tacitus, Gibbon and Voltaire ; Niebuhr, Macaulay, Carlyle, Buckle, Green, Mommsen and Froude, he must study their systems, and, avoiding the mistakes into which they fell, thoughtfully accommodating himself to the conditions of the present, he must prepare to fulfil the mission before him. He will then in time devise what is so greatly needed for our political life, the distinctively American historical method of the future. Of this we have as yet had hardly the promise, and that only recently through the pages of Fiske and Mahan ; and I cannot help surmising that it is to some Eastern seed planted here in the freer environment of the more fruitful West that we must look for its ultimate realization.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

APPENDIX.

THE full record of J. Q. Adams's utterances on this most important subject has never been made up. (See *Works of Charles Sumner*, VI. 19-23, VII. 142.) Historically speaking, it is of exceptional significance : and, accordingly, for convenience of reference, a partial record is here presented.

In 1836 Mr. Adams represented in Congress what was then the Massachusetts "Plymouth" district. In April of that year the issue, which, just twenty-five years later, was to result in overt civil war, was fast assuming shape ; for on the 21st of the month, the battle of San Jacinto was fought, resulting immediately in the independence of Texas, and more remotely in its annexation to the United States and the consequent war of spoliation (1846-48) with Mexico. At the same time petitions in great number were pouring into Congress from the Northern states asking for the abolition of slavery, and the prohibition of the domestic slave-trade in the District of Columbia ; the admission into the Union of Arkansas, with a constitution recognizing slavery, was also under consideration. In the course of a long personal letter dated April 4, 1836, written

to the Hon. Solomon Lincoln, of Hingham, a prominent constituent of his, Mr. Adams made the following incidental reference to the whole subject, indicative of the degree to which the question of martial law as a possible factor in the solution of the problem then occupied his mind:

"The new pretensions of the Slave representation in Congress, of a right to refuse to receive Petitions, and that Congress have no Constitutional power to abolish slavery or the slave trade in the District of Columbia forced upon me so much of the discussion as I did take upon me, but in which you are well aware I did not and could not speak a tenth part of my mind. I did not, for example, start the question whether by the Law of God and of Nature man can hold property, hereditary property in man—I did not start the question whether in the event of a servile insurrection and War, Congress would not have complete, unlimited control over the whole subject of slavery even to the emancipation of all the slaves in the State where such insurrection should break out, and for the suppression of which the freemen in Plymouth and Norfolk Counties, Massachusetts, should be called by Acts of Congress to pour out their treasures and to shed their blood. Had I spoken my mind on those two points the sturdiest of the abolitionists would have disavowed the sentiments of their champion."

A little more than seven weeks after thus writing, Mr. Adams made the following entries in his diary:

May 25th. "At the House, the motion of Robertson, to recommit Pinckney's slavery report, with instructions to report a resolution declaring that Congress has no constitutional authority to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, as an amendment to the motion for printing an extra number of the report, was first considered. Robertson finished his speech, which was vehement. . . .

"Immediately after the conclusion of Robertson's speech I addressed the Speaker, but he gave the floor to Owens, of Georgia, one of the signing members of the committee, who moved the previous question, and refused to withdraw it. It was seconded and carried, by yeas and nays. . . .

"The hour of one came, and the order of the day was called—a joint resolution from the Senate, authorizing the President to cause rations to be furnished to suffering fugitives from Indian hostilities in Alabama and Georgia. Committee of the whole on the Union, and a debate of five hours, in which I made a speech of about an hour, wherein I opened the whole subject of the Mexican, Indian, negro, and English war."

It was in the course of this speech that Mr. Adams first enunciated the principle of emancipation through martial law, exercised under the Constitution in time of war. He did so in the following passage:

"Mr. Chairman, are you ready for all these wars? A Mexican war? A war with Great Britain if not with France? A general Indian war? A servile war? And, as an inevitable consequence of them all, a civil war? For it must ultimately terminate in a war of colors as well as of races. And do you imagine that, while with your eyes open you are wilfully kindling, and then closing your eyes and blindly rushing into them; do you imagine that while in the very nature of things, your own

Southern and Southwestern States must be the Flanders of these complicated wars, the battlefield on which the last great battle must be fought between slavery and emancipation ; do you imagine that your Congress will have no constitutional authority to interfere with the institution of slavery *in any way* in the States of this Confederacy ? Sir, they must and will interfere with it—perhaps to sustain it by war ; perhaps to abolish it by treaties of peace ; and they will not only possess the constitutional power so to interfere, but they will be bound in duty to do it by the express provisions of the Constitution itself. From the instant that your slaveholding States become the theatre of war, civil, servile or foreign, from that instant the war powers of Congress extend to interference with the institution of slavery in every way in which it can be interfered with, from a claim of indemnity for slaves taken or destroyed, to the cession of the State burdened with slavery to a foreign power."

The following references to this speech are then found in the diary :

May 29th.—“ I was occupied all the leisure of the day and evening in writing out for publication my speech made last Wednesday in the House of Representatives—one of the most hazardous that I ever made, and the reception of which, even by the people of my own district and State, is altogether uncertain.”

June 2d.—“ My speech on the distribution of rations to the fugitives from Indian hostilities in Alabama and Georgia was published in the National Intelligencer of this morning, and a subscription paper was circulated in the House for printing it in a pamphlet, for which Gales told me there were twenty-five hundred copies ordered. Several members of the House of both parties spoke of it to me, some with strong dissent.”

June 19th.—“ My speech on the rations comes back with echoes of thundering vituperation from the South and West, and with one universal shout of applause from the North and East. This is a cause upon which I am entering at the last stage of life, and with the certainty that I cannot advance in it far ; my career must close, leaving the cause at the threshold. To open the way for others is all that I can do. The cause is good and great.”

So far as the record goes, the doctrine was not again propounded by Mr. Adams until 1841. On the 7th of June of that year he made a speech in the House of Representatives in support of a motion for the repeal of the Twenty-first Rule of the House, commonly known as “ the Atherton Gag.” Of this speech, no report exists ; but in the course of it he again enunciated the martial law theory of emancipation. The next day he was followed in debate by C. J. Ingersoll, of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who took occasion to declare that what he had heard the day previous had made his “ blood curdle with horror.”

“ Mr. Adams here rose in explanation, and said he did not say that in the event of a servile war or insurrection of slaves, the Constitution of the United States would be at an end. What he did say was this, that in the event of a servile war or insurrection of slaves, if the people of the free States were called upon to suppress the insurrection, and to spend their blood and treasure in putting an end to the war—a war in which the distinguished Virginian, the author of the Declaration of Independence, had said that ‘ God has no attribute in favor of the master ’—

then he would not say that Congress might not interfere with the institution of slavery in the States, and that, through the *treaty-making power*, universal emancipation might not be the result."

The following year the contention was again discussed in the course of the memorable debate on the "Haverhill Petition." Mr. Adams was then bitterly assailed by Henry A. Wise, of Virginia, and Thomas F. Marshall, of Kentucky. Mr. Adams at the time did not reply to them on this head; but, on the 14th of the following April, occasion offered, and he then once more laid down the law on the subject, as he understood it, and as it was subsequently put in force:—

"I would leave that institution to the exclusive consideration and management of the States more peculiarly interested in it, just as long as they can keep within their own bounds. So far I admit that Congress has no power to meddle with it. As long as they do not step out of their own bounds, and do not put the question to the people of the United States, whose peace, welfare, and happiness are all at stake, so long I will agree to leave them to themselves. But when a member from a free State brings forward certain resolutions, for which, instead of reasoning to disprove his positions, you vote a censure upon him, and that without hearing, it is quite another affair. At the time this was done I said that, as far as I could understand the resolutions proposed by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Giddings), there were some of them for which I was ready to vote, and some which I must vote against; and I will now tell this House, my constituents, and the world of mankind, that the resolution against which I should have voted was that in which he declares that what are called the slave States have the exclusive right of consultation on the subject of slavery. For that resolution I never would vote, because I believe that it is not just, and does not contain constitutional doctrine. I believe that so long as the slave States are able to sustain their institutions without going abroad or calling upon other parts of the Union to aid them or act on the subject, so long I will consent never to interfere.

"I have said this, and I repeat it; but if they come to the free States and say to them you must help us to keep down our slaves, you must aid us in an insurrection and a civil war, then I say that with that call comes a full and plenary power to this House and to the Senate over the whole subject. It is a war power. I say it is a war power, and when your country is actually in war, whether it be a war of invasion or a war of insurrection, Congress has power to carry on the war, and must carry it on according to the laws of war; and by the laws of war an invaded country has all its laws and municipal institutions swept by the board, and martial law takes the place of them. This power in Congress has, perhaps, never been called into exercise under the present Constitution of the United States. But when the laws of war are in force, what, I ask, is one of those laws? It is this: that when a country is invaded, and two hostile armies are set in martial array, the commanders of both armies have power to emancipate all the slaves in the invaded territory. Nor is this a mere theoretic statement. The history of South America shows that the doctrine has been carried into practical execution within the last thirty years. Slavery was abolished in Colombia, first, by the Spanish General, Morillo, and, secondly, by the American General, Bolívar. It was abolished by virtue of a military command given at the

head of the army, and its abolition continues to be law to this day. It was abolished by the laws of war, and not by municipal enactments; the power was exercised by military commanders under instructions, of course, from their respective Governments. And here I recur again to the example of General Jackson. What are you now about in Congress? You are passing a grant to refund to General Jackson the amount of a certain fine imposed upon him by a Judge under the laws of the State of Louisiana. You are going to refund him the money, with interest; and this you are going to do because the imposition of the fine was unjust. And why was it unjust? Because General Jackson was acting under the laws of war, and because the moment you place a military commander in a district which is the theatre of war, the laws of war apply to that district. . . .

"I might furnish a thousand proofs to show that the pretensions of gentlemen to the sanctity of their municipal institutions under a state of actual invasion and of actual war, whether servile, civil, or foreign, is wholly unfounded, and that the laws of war do, in all such cases, take the precedence. I lay this down as the law of nations. I say that the military authority takes for the time the place of all municipal institutions, and slavery among the rest; and that, under that state of things, so far from its being true that the States where slavery exists have the exclusive management of the subject, not only the President of the United States but the commander of the army has power to order the universal emancipation of the slaves. I have given here more in detail a principle which I have asserted on this floor before now, and of which I have no more doubt, than that you, Sir, occupy that Chair. I give it in its development, in order that any gentleman from any part of the Union may, if he thinks proper, deny the truth of the position, and may maintain his denial; not by indignation, not by passion and fury, but by sound and sober reasoning from the laws of nations and the laws of war. And if my position can be answered and refuted, I shall receive the refutation with pleasure; I shall be glad to listen to reason, aside, as I say, from indignation and passion. And if by the force of reasoning my understanding can be convinced, I here pledge myself to recant what I have asserted.

"Let my position be answered; let me be told, let my constituents be told, the people of my State be told,—a State whose soil tolerates not the foot of a slave,—that they are bound by the Constitution to a long and toilsome march under burning summer suns and a deadly Southern clime for the suppression of a servile war; that they are bound to leave their bodies to rot upon the sands of Carolina, to leave their wives and their children orphans; that those who cannot march are bound to pour out their treasures while their sons or brothers are pouring out their blood to suppress a servile, combined with a civil or a foreign war, and yet there exists no power beyond the limits of the slave State where such war is raging to emancipate the slaves. I say, let this be proved—I am open to conviction; but until that conviction comes I put it forth not as a dictate of feeling, but as a settled maxim of the laws of nations, that in such a case the military supersedes the civil power."

The only comment on this utterance made by Mr. Adams in his diary was the following:—"My speech on this day stung the slaveocracy to madness."

Here the proposition rested until 1861, when the course of events brought into forcible application the principles abstractly enunciated twenty years before by Mr. Adams.

MIRABEAU'S SECRET MISSION TO BERLIN¹

ONE of the most sensational and damaging books ever published for the sins of a feeble and foolish government and the delectation of a scandal-loving public was Mirabeau's *Secret History of the Court of Berlin*. The unanimous outcry that greeted its appearance is not difficult to understand. Prince Henry of Prussia, brother of the illustrious Frederick, was at the time the guest of the French court, and here was a semi-official agent of that court informing the world that the Prince was narrow, vain, incapable and ridiculous; the peril of a war with the most military power of Europe had but recently been avoided, and here were thrown to the public quasi-diplomatic reports to the French government showing up the ruler of the Prussian monarchy as a "king of weaklings," as a feeble-minded, self-opinionated, boorish monarch, whom profligacy and conceit alone swayed. In these able, trenchant and witty pages, the surroundings of the Prussian court were unmercifully painted in lurid and scandalous colors, as they had originally been depicted in the dispatches sent from Berlin by Mirabeau for the information and amusement of the advisers of Louis XVI., perhaps for that of the King himself. The fate of the book was clearly written and easy to forecast. Versailles made hurried apologies to Potsdam, the author bowed before the storm and brazenly denied all paternity, and the hangman, on an order of the Parliament of Paris, consigned it in due form to the flames; all of which matters in no way prevented the reading of the book by all who could procure a copy.

Between the publication of the original edition by Malassis at Alençon in 1789 and of the latest one, now under review, various reprints have appeared, of which Mr. Welschinger, the present editor, purports to give a complete list; his attention may be directed to at least two which he has failed to notice: one by Blasdron (Pater-noster Row, 1789), the other by P. Byrne (Dublin), of the same date.

The present edition does great credit to the indefatigable French historian, and it must be said at the earliest possible moment that Mr. Welschinger appears at his best when treating a subject that

¹ *La Mission Secrète de Mirabeau à Berlin, 1786-1787*; d'après les documents originaux des Archives des Affaires Étrangères, avec introduction et notes par Henri Welschinger. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1900.

does not relate to the beloved Napoleon. The editing has been well and thoroughly done; for the first time the names left in blank in all former editions have been successfully filled in, and Mr. Welschinger has added to the whole an introductory essay on Mirabeau that is acceptable and readable. This said, one or two criticisms may not be out of place. The first of these relates to the title. Why name the book *La Mission Secrète de Mirabeau à Berlin* when in reality it is nothing more than an amplified edition of the *Histoire Secrète de la Cour de Berlin*? What is meant is this. Mr. Welschinger had clearly two courses before him,—either to edit Mirabeau's original book, in which case his title should have been the original title,—or to relate the history of Mirabeau's mission, giving as a part of that history the text of the dispatches, in which case the title he has chosen would have been justified. Between these two courses Mr. Welschinger has hesitated; he has given us perhaps more than an edition, certainly less than a history. Working in the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, he has filled the blanks left in all former editions with the names of the people for whom they stood; he has added some interesting letters from Talleyrand to Mirabeau, and from Esterno to Vergennes; further, he has collated Trenck and annotated profusely. Had he but gone a step further and adequately dealt with two difficult and obscure matters of great interest and vital importance he might have claimed to have given us a full and authoritative relation of a curious and, in some ways, mysterious international episode; omitting these, as he practically does, he lays himself open to the criticism of incompleteness that has just been made. Mr. Welschinger makes no attempt to follow out either the financial interests that played so large a part in Mirabeau's mission to Berlin, or his relations with the secret societies, the Freemasons, the *Illuminés*, the German Union.

Besides, one or two criticisms of detail may be made. The dispatch Number XII. that is given under date August 22, was certainly written earlier, probably between the 10th and the 15th of that month. The date assigned to dispatch Number XVII. is obviously wrong.

Among the prominent figures of the French Revolution, that of Mirabeau is perhaps the most typical of that violent social upheaval, but beneath the rugged and hideous distortion of his large features was concealed immense common sense and a constructive genius that placed him far in front of most of his contemporaries. He appeared by his face, by the strange violence and passion of his life, by his flaming disregard for decency, for reserve, for honor, by the overflowing of his superabundant vital energy, to personify the

return to the state of nature preached in the literature of his time,—but to nature, not under its Watteau or Trianon aspect, not as seen from the banks of blue Geneva, but to ferocious, volcanic, all-devouring nature,—that of the *Septembriseurs* and of the *Carmagnole*. But under all his extraordinary lack of moral restraint, of respect for the rights and opinions of others, under all his overweening vanity and overbearing insolence and invective, Mirabeau was possessed of a keen, shrewd insight that showed him facts as they were, and not as they appeared. To this he added the rare power of clear and effective expression, which, when he wrote or spoke with sincerity, at times rose to the greatest height of forcible eloquence. He wrote letters (as some of these from Berlin) that in delicacy of wit and irony equal the most vaunted of Madame de Sévigne's, but that in force, in knowledge, in freedom from artifice, immeasurably surpass them. There was nothing mincing about Mirabeau. As the flow of his pen, so that of his tongue, and as his written words brought financial ruin and caused sovereigns to tremble, so those he spoke perhaps changed the face of Europe, might perhaps, had he lived, have saved a monarchy.

Gabriel Honoré de Riquetti, son of the Marquis de Mirabeau, was born in 1749. His father, known from the name of a successful pamphlet as *L'Ami des Hommes*, came from a family of *petite noblesse* that had for some generations been unfavorably known for the eccentricities of its members. The marquis duly maintained the traditions of his fathers, or surpassed them even; for in vice and profligacy he was a source of wonder even to that remarkable generation. His wife was not much better than he, and the quarrels and disorders of the couple were for some years the standing scandal of France.

The old marquis, among his other amiable peculiarities, was a domestic tyrant of the worst kind, for which, as well as for the vicious example their parents presented, his large family had to pay. Daughters were made to marry or to take the veil at the earliest possible age, and young Mirabeau was subjected to a system of harsh discipline totally unsuited to his precocious, expansive and intelligent nature.

The repression that had marked the period of his early education had not tended to improve his character. It was at length exchanged for the military service. Hardly had he entered on this career than he embarked on a series of grave disorders that resulted in imprisonment. After his release he served in an expedition to Corsica, and there, apparently, revealed military talents of a high order. Although only eighteen he was already beginning to im-

press those with whom he came into contact with a sense of his extraordinary powers. His uncle, who had no great love for him, says: "Unless the cleverest impostor in the world, he is of the finest stuff for the making of a pope, a captain by sea or land, a chancellor, or even an agriculturist."

Shortly after his return from Corsica, young Mirabeau married a wealthy *parti*, and settled down to a provincial life. But his idea of a quiet country life was all his own, he was soon in debt, and indulged himself in a violence of conduct, a viciousness of living and an overbearingness of manner that surpassed the worst eccentricities of his forefathers. His wife was not much better, and was unfaithful; finally a disgraceful and famous fracas, in which Madame de Cabris and Monsieur de Mouan were concerned, resulted in the intervention of the Marquis de Mirabeau, who obtained a *lettre de cachet* in virtue of which his unruly son was relegated to a royal prison. The restraint he was placed under appears to have been light; it allowed him sufficient liberty to make the acquaintance of the very commonplace Sophie, Marquise de Monnier; this lady, whose husband was too old to attract her, fell in love with the hideously ugly, but magnetically attractive prisoner. In the end she eloped with him, the guilty pair escaping to Holland with what of the husband's money the fair one had been able to purloin. It was during this first sojourn abroad that Mirabeau developed the power, which he had not long since discovered, of writing for the press. Pamphlets and reviews of books of a democratic character soon made him a name as an eloquent and dangerous pamphleteer. He might have resided in peace in Holland, but with characteristic violence in one of his productions he indulged himself in the luxury of a virulent attack on his father and friends; this resulted in his prompt arrest through the action of the French embassy at the Hague. In his absence from France he had been condemned to decapitation, but his fate was imprisonment at Vincennes, where he was destined to pass the next four years of his life.

It was while thus imprisoned, that Mirabeau composed his correspondence with Sophie, long considered his best work, the most effective passages of which should be read with a considerable grain of rhetorical salt. But this is not the place in which to dwell on this famous literary incident. The termination of his seclusion came as the result of the intercession of his father and of his wife, which he did not hesitate to abjectly entreat.

Then followed stormy times. The old marquis, the young count, and their wives, plunged into the vortex of conjugal and family disputes. Twisting and turning, lying and quibbling, they amazed the

public and even the lawyers with their venom, violence and turpitude ; but furthest of all carried the Titan voice of young Mirabeau, and the loud and brazen speechifying that made of him, with his family, the public nuisance of France, revealed him to the world as her most splendid and masterful orator.

It was then, while he stood at the bar of astonished and scandalized public opinion, the most notorious character of France, his vices written large on his distorted, bloated, pock-marked face, that Henriette van Haren, better known as Madame de Nehra, met him. She was only nineteen and knew little of the world. With all the spontaneous courage of her age, and after conquering the first natural movement of repulsion, she fell under the irresistible spell of the monster and determined to throw in her lot with his. It was with this young girl, of whom her contemporaries never spoke but with respect and regard, that Mirabeau spent the next few years of his tempestuous life,—they were to be those in which his excesses were least conspicuous, and his manners and thought least extravagant.

From the uproar and resentments he had aroused in his native land, the unrestrainable pamphleteer sought a refuge in England ; there he met many prominent men, assisted at sittings of the House of Commons, continued to publish, and voraciously to read whatever came to hand, especially the works of the economists. From what Mirabeau saw, heard, and read on this visit, may be traced many of the political, financial and administrative ideas that he turned to such good use afterwards as a member of the Assemblée Nationale. Expatriation, however, soon proved irksome ; Madame de Nehra crossed the channel and succeeded in obtaining an assurance from Breteuil that Mirabeau would be unmolested if he went back to Paris. He accordingly returned and became engaged in a new series of events that were to culminate in the mission to Berlin.

Among the pamphlets published by Mirabeau during his stay in England was one dealing with the stock-jobbing that was a prevalent mania of his time. Having returned to Paris, he continued to devote much of his attention to things financial, and in 1785 brought out *La Liberté de l'Escompte* ("on the non-restraint of discount"). This attracted the attention of the well-known Swiss bankers, Panchaud and Clavière ; they soon made the acquaintance of the pamphleteer. Panchaud was the biggest operator in stocks of Paris, and, like his successors of the present day, placed much reliance on secret and exclusive information and on the influencing of public opinion through the press ; he was surrounded by a large

circle of aristocratic hangers-on. Panchaud was also a freemason, and finance, free-masonry, and the opposition aristocracy all jostled very closely in his *salons*. It was there that Mirabeau met the Duc de Chartres, the most important personage in the masonic world, soon to be known as Philippe Égalité, Duc d' Orléans, his boon companion, the Duc de Lauzun, and, among others, the Abbé de Périgord, who achieved renown later as the Prince de Talleyrand. Here then was the greatest practical intellect of the day, a man with no other principle than that of his own advancement, placed at the centre of all financial and secret intrigue, in the midst of the shrewdest bankers, the most scheming adventurers and the most unprejudiced and ambitious politicians of France. What Mr. Welschinger has failed to bring out is that in this group was concentrated a power of money, of intellect and of secret intrigue, that made of it one of the principal forces of France.

The bankers' ring having secured this new and invaluable ally were not long in putting his powers to the test. It so happened that Calonne, controller of the King's finances, who since he had succeeded Necker two years before, had been engaged in a perpetual struggle to stave off bankruptcy, had arrived at the opinion that the secret of the low quotations of the state securities was the inflated price to which speculation had sent the shares of certain public companies. From this opinion, the controller drew a sage conclusion : if the quotations of the great speculative securities could be brought down to something like a representative price, the state securities would then attract more attention and rise in value. Starting from a totally different point of view, the bankers' ring were also anxious to depreciate the prices of certain gambling stocks, though it may be surmised that it was not in the expectation of seeing the state securities benefit from a big fall of prices. Be that as it may, Calonne and the ring, working together, intrusted their work to Mirabeau, and wonderfully well did he perform it. Clavière crammed him with the facts, and he put them into brilliant and masterly prose ; with so much expedition did he labor, it is said, that one production of three hundred pages only occupied him eight days. Before the avalanche of abuse, ridicule and invective thus showered forth, the shares of the Bank of St. Charles fell from 800 to 320, the Paris Water-Works fell 44 %, the Caisse d'Escompte dropped in sympathy, despite the efforts of Beaumarchais and his friends, and a financial panic ensued in which every quoted security, including of course those of the state, fell heavily. Panchaud, Clavière and their friends netted large profits over the operation, but as to poor M. de Calonne, he gained nothing but a somewhat expensive lesson in

finance at heavy cost to his pocket and to that of the King. Angered at the unexpected and fatal result of the pamphleteer's eloquence, Calonne turned furiously against Mirabeau, and the latter, for his own protection, prepared a violent pamphlet against the minister, showing the latter's financial iniquities in the most merciless light. Armed with this unpublished tirade, as with a loaded pistol held at the controller's head, Mirabeau, with his powerful backing, was in a position to make terms. It was decided that he should leave Paris; his services being no longer urgently required, it was as well to utilize his talents in some new direction. This was what the bankers' group, or let us say Panchaud, Clavière, Talleyrand, Lauzun, arranged, with the consent of the pamphleteer. He was to go to Berlin where, through the relations of the *Amis Réunis*, a sect of Freemasons concerning which something more will appear presently, they had a secret means of acting. Mirabeau was to spy out the land,—politically, for the benefit of Calonne and the government,—financially, for that of his friends who had their eyes fixed on Frederick the Great's hoarded millions, and vaguely contemplated the establishment of a bank at Berlin. In addition to these objects, in which others were interested, Mirabeau may be conjectured to have had in mind that he might find, to his own profit, some opening suitable to his talents in the Prussian administration, that he might reveal himself in so brilliant a light as to force his way into the French diplomatic service, or that he might, at the worst, find new material on which to found a new series of his ever flowing publications.

Mirabeau left France on his German adventure at the end of the year 1785. Mr. Welschinger states that his only letter of recommendation was one from Vergennes, Minister of Foreign Affairs, to Esterno, French ambassador at Berlin. This statement must be taken for what it is worth, and cannot be accepted as correct from the narrow standpoint of strict proof. It is more than probable that Mirabeau was furnished with at least equally important recommendations from the French bankers to their German correspondents and from the *Amis Réunis* to the highest masonic and other secret circles at Berlin. Besides this, he was already in close relations with Major Mauvillon, with whom he was collaborating a history of Frederick the Great; this officer was a prominent "Illuminé," and it is noticeable that among others of the Frenchman's earliest acquaintances in Germany may be noted the names of such well-known "Illuminés" as Charles von Struensee, Nicolai, Luchet, and others; it was the latter who wrote the *Essai sur les Illuminés* that has been wrongly ascribed to Mirabeau. In addition to these already suffi-

cient openings, the French pamphleteer may be guessed to have had easy access to the circle in which Barth, Nicolai and Walther were conspicuous, or in other words, to the "German Union." Mr. Welschinger's hesitation at entering this very obscure field of history may be easily understood, for the authorities are contradictory, uncertain and misleading, but however difficult and unsatisfactory the task, it may be better to attempt to give some sort of indication of what must ever remain a very obscure chapter of history, than to take the course Mr. Welschinger does of ignoring what is incapable of strict proof. Unless some general view of the operations of the secret societies of France and Germany be obtained, no correct survey of the basis of Mirabeau's mission to Berlin can be had.

France and Germany, not to mention other parts of Europe, were at that time sown with masonic lodges, but the practice of the Masons of the two countries differed widely, as did that of the individual lodges. In France, new sects arose, and rites of all sorts, some of them wildly extravagant. Still, as a whole, the lodges remained essentially masonic in character. Without giving an extended account of the sects, and of the peculiarities of such lodges as those of the "Chevaliers Bénefaisants" of Lyons, or of the "Contrat Social" at Paris, without dwelling on the Martinistes, the Amis Réunis and the Philalethes, or on such excesses as were committed, for instance, at Ermenonville under the guidance of the quack St. Germain, the only fact that need be insisted on is that a great body of French Masons were grouped as Philalethes, or Amis Réunis, into the "Grand Orient" of France under the Mastership of the Duc de Chartres, afterwards Duc d'Orléans, and that the Panchaud-Talleyrand group were within the innermost circle. Among the foreign correspondents of this group, it is as nearly certain as possible that Ferdinand of Brunswick, Mauvillon and d'Alberg can be placed, the latter then, as in later days, a far more important personage than he appeared to the public. Leaving the Amis Réunis for the present, let us cross the frontier.

In Germany, the Masons had not gone so far in variation and complexity of ritual as in France, though the "strict observance," in which the Duke of Brunswick took a prominent part, deserves mention; on the other hand, several secret societies arose from among the masonic lodges, with well defined and advanced programmes. Leaving on one side the Rosicrucians, who need not enter into the subject and who may be dismissed as an offshoot of masonry, the most famous of these were the *Illuminati* or *Illuminés*, as they shall be called here. The founder of this society was a

professor of the University of Ingolstadt, Weisshaupt by name. The principal object of the association was, if the truth be told, to concentrate as much power as possible in the hands of its founder. But to those initiated into its highest grades and most solemn mysteries, the doctrines of the equality of men, of the falsity of religion, and of the foundation of the universal republic were gradually unfolded. Illuminism spread with tremendous rapidity, chiefly in masonic circles, and received accessions from even the highest ranks ; for some years it flourished unsuspected. Finally the Elector of Bavaria first suspected, then discovered it, and it was ostensibly suppressed in 1783. But the only result of the steps taken by the Elector was to break up the centre of the society, to put an end to the leadership of Weisshaupt ; the Illuminés continued to flourish in various parts of Germany under a variety of forms for some years, and included among their members representatives of all classes, even of royalty, though the latter, it may be guessed, never reached the highest grades. From among the Illuminés arose the less important but very curious "German Union." The programme and the doctrines of the latter resembled closely those of the former, but it had a business side. It included all the principal publishers of Germany, and their aim was to convert it into a secret trade-guild giving them a monopoly of public opinion and of publishing profits. It was to be a secret continuation under a somewhat more convenient style of the ancient *Gelehrtenbuchhandlung*. Under cover of the reading-rooms and literary clubs which the German Union instituted, it was sought to control the thinking public by decrees issued from Leipzig. The *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek* and the *Berlinische Monatschrift* were the organs of the German Union ; Mirabeau assiduously studied both these publications. The importance of this curious society was short-lived and never very great ; the scandal of Dr. Barth finished it.

Among the Masons and their offshoots on both sides of the frontier, Mesmer, Cagliostro, Lavater, St. Germain and all the quacks and spiritualists prospered. But it is a mistake to identify any of these men, or the movements they exploited, with any or all of the societies named. Some lodges and many Masons, Illuminés and others, doubtless fell under their influence, while they were always ready to enroll and proclaim themselves members of these societies. But other lodges, other Masons and Illuminés despised and ridiculed them. Men with hard heads like Mirabeau, Weisshaupt, Talleyrand and Nicolai, were not to be taken in by jugglery and charlatanism, even if King Frederick William and Fräulein von Voss were.

Having thus briefly called attention to a state of affairs that placed Mirabeau in a position in many ways advantageous and exceptional, we must return to an account of his journey.

Immediately on his arrival at Berlin, he characteristically wrote to the old King asking for an audience. Frederick, with his usual expedition, immediately answered the French traveller, granting his request. A first interview was followed by several others, and established Mirabeau as a person of importance at Berlin. In the meanwhile he saw much of Mauvillon and moved in literary and diplomatic circles. He appears to have particularly cultivated the acquaintance of Von Dohm of the Prussian Foreign Ministry, of Prince Henry, the King's brother, and of Ewart, the very clever first secretary of the British legation, who was to prove in the near future at least as clever a diplomat as Mirabeau himself. Esterno, the French ambassador, a man of little judgment and no weight, was evidently not delighted at the appearance of this irregular representative of the French ministry, and in his dispatches to Ver-gennes showed considerable animus against the new-comer.

As usual, the indefatigable French pamphleteer was not long idle; absorbing the new facts about him with the utmost facility, he gave them out again adorned with the brilliancy of form which he knew how to impart. At this period he came within the influence of the great German publisher Nicolai, a prominent Illuminé and member of the German Union, and did much literary work for him, including, it is probable, the writing of some violent attacks on the Prussian political system and administration. His principal acknowledged production was a defence of the famous Jewish philosopher, Moses Mendelssohn, a friend of Nicolai's.

But political affairs were the ostensible object of Mirabeau's journey, and he accordingly prepared for M. de Calonne a *Memorandum* on the European situation. The statements contained in this document we need not follow, but, to place the reader at the right point of view for judging of what is to ensue, the position of affairs in Europe, as they might appear in Berlin, must now be briefly summed up.

By far the most important and interesting figure on the stage of politics was that of the aged King of Prussia. The terrible Seven Years' War had left the great Frederick in possession of desolated Silesia, and had established his reputation as the greatest general since Julius Caesar. The period of war over, he had ruled his subjects stringently, but with economy, had drilled his splendid army to his heart's content, and had cultivated the arts of peace. The greatest personal prestige in Europe was his, the most perfectly organized army and the largest reserve of gold. As against this, Prussia was

actuated by no very well-defined aggressive ambition"; the one point on which her foreign policy was likely to lead her into difficulties shall be indicated presently.

Russia, under Catherine II., was principally occupied in repressing Poland and extending her borders at the expense of Turkey. The affairs of Sweden and Courland need not be noticed here.

Austria, under Joseph II., was on amicable terms with Russia, and also with France, through the Emperor's sister, Marie Antoinette. Up to the year 1786, his chief preoccupation had been internal reforms of a liberal character; from that date, his policy became one of expansion towards the south. Yet Prussia viewed with suspicion the son of Maria Theresa, and could never feel entirely certain that the conquest of Silesia was forgotten and that the Emperor would not some day attempt its recovery or perhaps seek compensation in some other direction.

England was fast recovering from the effects of the disastrous war which, arising out of the foolish policy pursued towards her American colonies, had resulted in the humiliating treaty of Paris. Wiser counsels were now in the ascendant, the younger Pitt had commenced his administration of affairs, and the public funds were rising by leaps and bounds. Commerce and finance now engrossed the attention of England's statesmen, while on the Continent such shrewd men as Harris, Dalrymple and Ewart were rapidly increasing her lately impaired influence.

France was on the verge of a great revolution; for a century past her monarchs and ministers had, with but rare exceptions, been distinguished for nothing but profligacy, dishonesty and incompetence. Yet the wealth of the country had increased, principally through the exertions of the middle class, professional and mercantile, that had vastly increased in numbers and importance. Finance and speculation had been introduced, and notwithstanding one or two panics, the extent of the banking and company operations testified, not only to the wealth, but to the enterprise of the country. Alongside of this class, in which intelligence, whether honest or otherwise, was the one means of success, arose a school of writers of whom Diderot, Voltaire and Rousseau may be recalled; these literary giants and their followers, together with the French travellers and soldiers who had visited America at the time of the War of Independence, had set the fashion of thinking towards the natural rights of man, and against maladministration and despotism. Last of all, the condition of the masses was deplorable, and worse, in that it was largely remediable. The farming of the revenue, the restrictions on inland circulation, the improvidence, incapacity and dishonesty of

those in high places were plagues that occasionally brought terrible results. While in one part of France a surplus of wheat brought its owners no return, in a neighboring province the people would be eating grass, and dying of starvation. The finances of a country, that a very few years of good administration should have made wealthy, had been reduced by the long infliction of divine right, incapacity, and aristocratic robbery, to a state of chaos and bankruptcy; under an unintelligent and obstinate king and senseless and venal ministers, France was fast sinking into the gulf of revolution.

The chief preoccupation of the western powers was the question of Holland. The curious constitution of that country, an incompatible mixture of monarchism and republicanism, was always giving rise to trouble between stadholders of the House of Orange and the democratic party. One of these periodical difficulties was now engrossing the attention of European diplomacy. Wilhelmina, niece of Frederick, sister of the Prince of Prussia, afterwards Frederick William II., was the wife of the stadholder, so that the House of Orange had a family claim to the support of the royal house of Prussia as well as to that of Great Britain. The English diplomats were striving hard to effect a *rapprochement* between the two powers on this question, thereby hoping to strengthen their country's European position by bringing her into line once more with the great military power of Frederick. France, in a spirit of half-hearted opposition to England, had been supporting the democratic party in Holland; the questions a French statesman might well ask himself were these: How would the probably early death of Frederick affect the situation? Would Austria be persuaded to bring pressure to bear on Prussia, either in the direction of Silesia, or by attempting the succession of the childless Elector of Bavaria? Could an understanding on the question of Holland be effected? How could a *rapprochement* or alliance between England and Prussia be prevented? In his memorial to Calonne, which is dated June 2, 1786, Mirabeau predicts the death of Frederick within two months (a very shrewd guess as will be seen). After brilliantly summing up the international position, not without a passing stab at Esterno, he concludes that the best line of policy for France is to come to terms with Prussia and England on the basis of a reciprocal guarantee of actual possessions. For bait to England, he places foremost a commercial treaty which he well knew would coincide with the views of Pitt, of his friends in Paris, and of the French ministers.

France had one or two good cards to play and the diplomatic *volte-face* recommended by Mirabeau was not only feasible, but

offered many advantages. The anxiety of the English diplomats at that time may well be exemplified by a quotation from a dispatch from Sir James Harris, then minister at the Hague and afterwards better known as Lord Malmesbury, to Lord Carmarthen; it is dated February 26, 1786. Alluding to Mirabeau, he writes: ". . . I must needs confess . . . that I strongly admit in my own mind the belief of a secret understanding and fellow feeling between Prussia and France, and that they say to each other, as Molière's doctors,—*Passez moi la rhubarbe, et je vous passerai le séné.*—Let me alone in Holland, says France, and you, Prussia, shall have nothing to fear in Bavaria."

For a few days of June Mirabeau returned to Paris. The views he had so ably presented had been heartily indorsed by the clique; Calonne, easily influenced, and still dreading the terrible unpublished pamphlet that was to expose his financial iniquities to the public, was persuaded to agree to Mirabeau's return to Berlin as secret agent of the government. It was arranged that his dispatches should be sent through the intermediary of Talleyrand, whose task it would be to decipher them and to present them to the minister; it was also further arranged that Calonne should supply the necessary funds.

It was while on this brief visit to Paris that Mirabeau is asserted (by Barruel, Robison and other authorities of the same class) to have introduced the secret organization and doctrines of the Illuminés into France. It is said that he had been initiated by Mauvillon and that his journey to Paris had for its principal object the initiation of Talleyrand, Orléans, Lauzun, and other prominent members of the Grand Orient. Such a statement, derived by Barruel from an unknown source, is not made to command confidence, at the same time it would be a mistake to reject a statement, otherwise probable, merely because it owes its origin to that not very scientific historian. Whether Mirabeau was an Illuminé or not can probably never be proved now, but that he was is at least highly probable (notwithstanding his own disclaimers); that he initiated his friends on the occasion of his visit to Paris in June, 1786, is just as incapable of proof, but there is nothing inherently improbable about it, though it is quite certain that such an occurrence cannot be assigned to September, 1786, as has been done by some writers, for Mirabeau spent most of that month in Dresden.

The sixty-six dispatches sent to Talleyrand from Berlin are full of interest from the first line to the last; at times they rise to the highest pitch of literary merit; they are never dull. Mirabeau surveys everything that the court of Prussia can show with the keen

and cynical eye of a philosopher and political free-lance. His observations on matters commercial, financial, political and social, are vivid and full of food for reflection, but he does not hesitate to vent his spite, when the occasion serves, and to relate scandalous stories about the highest personages, calculated to tickle the highly seasoned palates of Talleyrand and his other good friends, and, when he believes that by so doing he can further his own interests, to boldly invent facts. It is not possible within the space of this article to go through these dispatches at length ; only a few points of interest will be touched on, and the reader who would have the whole of the *chronique scandaleuse* of Berlin, the story of Fräulein von Voss and all the rest, must be referred to Mr. Welschinger's edition.

When Mirabeau reached Berlin in July, the public attention was centred on the last hours of the fast-failing Frederick. Copious details of the state of the King were sent off to Talleyrand by every courier ; on August 2 it is related that : " Frese (the King's doctor at Potsdam) is still very much in disgrace for having dared utter the word,—dropsy,—in answer to a summons to state, as a man of honor, the name and character of the disease. The King suffers from fits of shivering and is constantly wrapped in rugs and covered with quilts. He has not been to bed for six weeks. . . . What seems certain is that 'we' do not wish to die. . . . at all events the mind is not affected, and 'we' are even working particularly hard."

How Mirabeau heard of the death of the King, is related in the following lively manner, under date August 17 :

" The event is accomplished, Frederick William reigns, and one of the grandest characters ever formed by nature is dissolved. My firm resolve of friendly duty was that you should have the earliest news of this event, and my measures had been taken with the greatest care. At eight on the morning of Wednesday, I already knew that 'we' were at the last extremity ; that the day before 'we' had only given the pass-word at twelve instead of at eleven as usual ; that it was noon before 'we' had spoken to the secretaries who had been in attendance since five ; that notwithstanding this, the dispatches had been clear and precise ; that 'we' had again eaten immoderately, notably a lobster. Besides all this, I was aware that the lack of cleanliness prevailing about the patient's room and about him . . . had set up a sort of putrid fever ; that the somnolence of that day, Wednesday, was nearly lethargic ; that everything announced a hydropic apoplexy, a dissolution of the brain, and, in fine, that a few hours must in all probability witness the closing scene. At one o'clock I was on horseback on the road to Potsdam, drawn by some vague presentiment, when a groom came galloping by for Doctor Zelle, who was ordered not to lose a minute and who started at once. I soon learnt that the groom had killed his horse. . . . I hastened to the French minister's ; he was out ; he was dining at Charlottenburg, no means of meeting him at Berlin. I got myself dressed ; I

start for Schoenhausen and arrive at the Queen's at the same time as our representative ; he had no details and had no idea the King was in so serious a condition ; not one of the ministers would believe it. Lord Dalrymple, with whom I am on too good terms to dissemble, assured me I was mistaken. I answered, ' Possibly ; ' but I whispered to our minister that my news was from the bedside, and that he would be well advised to believe that a speculator might possibly be as well informed as a diplomat. " . . .

Mirabeau then goes on to describe the steps he took for insuring the safe dispatch of the great news to France ; special couriers outside the walls, pigeons, and so forth ; his precautions were infinite, for it was certain that the Prussian government would, at the first moment, put an embargo on all news.

" M. de Nolde was just leaving at half-past six in the morning, when General Goertz, aide-de-camp to the late King, came up at a tearing gallop, shouting :—By order of the King, close the gates, and so M. de Nolde had to turn back. Within five minutes I was mounted, (my horses had remained saddled all night), and, to accomplish my fullest duty, galloped off to the French minister's ; he was asleep ; I at once wrote that I had safe means of communication in case he had any occasion for such a convenience ; he answered, (and I have kept his note as a curious memento in case, though I can hardly believe it, M. de Vergennes should receive no dispatch) ;—' Le Comte d'Esterno has the honor of thanking Monsieur le Comte de Mirabeau ; he will not avail himself of his obliging offer. ' "

The accession of the Prince of Prussia to the throne left vacant by the death of his illustrious uncle gave rise to all the ambitions and uncertainties usual in such cases. A man of Mirabeau's temperament was not likely to be the last to bring himself to the notice of a new monarch from whom anything might be expected, he therefore composed a memorial, afterwards published under the title of *Lettre remise à Frédéric Guillaume II.*, which Mr. Welschinger would have been well advised had he added to his appendix.

Frederick William was an unknown quantity ; he was thought to be adverse to the routine of business and known to be addicted to pleasure. Would the new duties of his elevated station effect a change in him ? Prussia stood in need of reform ; Frederick had been economical and had accumulated a large reserve of gold, but his financial system had none the less been badly organized and disorderly ; it required radical alterations. Would the new king undertake them ? Could he be persuaded to intrust them to a really capable financier ? Would he be willing to earn an income by investing the gold of his predecessors in some remunerative manner to be indicated by such skilled financiers as Panchaud, Struensee, Mirabeau ?

Frederick William might have done worse, as the sequel proved, than take the French adventurer as his financial adviser, and this was doubtless the opinion of Mirabeau himself. His letter to Frederick William is a high pitched but fine piece of rhetorical flattery and advice ; it merits perusal as it is most characteristic of the writer. There is some internal evidence that tends to show that this letter was addressed by one Illuminé to another.

In the early days of the new reign it was expected that great authority would be exercised by Prince Henry, brother of the late king, but Frederick William soon showed that, even if he was not disposed to do the hard work of his station, he had no intention of sharing any of its authority. Neither with the King, nor with Prince Henry, to both of whom he made all possible advances, did Mirabeau succeed in improving his position ; he was too French and too heroic a remedy for the ills of Prussia.

Before the coolness of the King, and because of his equivocal unofficial position, Mirabeau soon found himself at a standstill ; a fortnight after the accession he writes :

"It is becoming very difficult to observe the King. He is introducing the strictest ceremonial of German etiquette. It is said that he will not receive foreigners, at all events for a while. I shall of course be informed of what is going on by the spying of valets, courtiers and secretaries, and also by the intemperate outbursts of Prince Henry ; but there are only two ways of really exercising influence here, that is in giving, or rather in suggesting, ideas to the master or to his ministers. To the master? How can I, as we do not meet? To the ministers? It is neither easy nor proper for me to broach business with them since I am not accredited, and those discussions that do arise by chance are short, vague, and interrupted. If my services are considered useful, I should be sent where I can be accredited, otherwise I shall cost more here than I am worth."

The question of Holland, that was eventually to lead to Prussian intervention, was fast coming to a head. Ewart, a very young diplomat, whose early death closed an interesting and promising career, was temporarily in charge of the British embassy at Berlin, and was successfully negotiating an understanding with the Prussian ministers. Mirabeau, with no official position, unsupported and unheeded by the ministers at Versailles, could do little to place France in a better position, and was condemned to look on while the friendship of England and Prussia became every day closer. If powerless and playing a losing game, he at all events kept his wits about him. The representative of England was beginning to assume a high tone about the rights of the Stadholder of Holland : "Yesterday, Mr. Ewart," writes Mirabeau, "secretary of the English legation, in the presence of fifteen people, M. de Hertzberg backing

him up the while by word and by gesture, addressed these very words to me,—The Stadholder is constitutionally the executive power of Holland, or, to put it more clearly, his position in Holland is precisely similar to that of the King in England. I answered with frigid irony,—Let us therefore hope the Hollanders will not cut his head off. The laugh was not with Mr. Ewart!"

To conclude with the affairs of Holland, it may be noted that not the least interesting of Mirabeau's dispatches from Berlin are those that refer to the efforts made by him to recover the ground lost by French diplomacy in this business. His arguments are plausible and show a fine grasp of political principles, but they leave an overwhelming impression of the falsity of the writer. It must be pronounced more than probable that both in the case of the negotiations with the Duke of Brunswick and with Baron de Reede, Mirabeau was actively engaged inventing diplomatic positions with the sole object of thereby securing his employment in the French diplomatic service.

On a small point of etiquette, a stupid slight had been put on the French ambassador; Mirabeau relates, in a pungent letter, how Frederick William tried to efface the bad impression that had been created.

"I shall commence this dispatch with some perfectly authentic information that appears to me decisive as to the character of the new reign. I will recall what I wrote on the 29th of August.—'The King seems to have determined to give up all his old habits; it is a noble effort! He retires before ten, he rises at four. . . . If only he perseveres he will afford a unique example of the habits of thirty years conquered. If he succeeds, he will reveal a force of character that will prove too much for all of us.' Well! like all the rest I was taken in by appearances. The truth is that at half-past nine, while we thought him asleep, he was celebrating Sardanapalian orgies in the innermost apartments of the palace. . . . What sort of mortal then is the master? I still think it would be hasty to come to a conclusion to-day, but one is tempted to answer,—the king of weaklings. No wit, no strength, no logic, no application, the taste of the hog of Epicurus, and of the heroic, nothing but pride, unless I mistake for that quality a narrow, shopkeeping vanity. . . . However I am not engaged on a second volume of Madame de Sévigné. I am not speaking evil of Frederick William because I have nothing to do with him, as she used to praise Louis XIV. because he had just made her dance a minuet. Yesterday at the Queen's circle he three times addressed me, and this for the first time in public. 'You have been to Magdeburg and Brunswick?' 'Yes, Sire.' 'What did you think of the manoeuvres?' 'I admired greatly.' 'I am asking you for the truth and not for a compliment.' 'Sire, the truth is to me that only the presence of Your Majesty could have enhanced such a superb sight.' 'And how is the Duke?' 'Perfectly well, Sire.' 'Will he soon be here?' 'Your Majesty alone can know.' . . . He smiled . . . That is a sample! You may well imagine that what is said before the whole court is a matter

of total indifference to me; but with the spectators it is far otherwise, and I note this as having been intended as some sort of reparation to France!"

In his dispatch of December 2, 1786, occurs a curious passage, too long to quote, in which Mirabeau with many expressions of dislike and horror describes proceedings and rites of initiation which he ascribes to the Illuminés. Among many authentic descriptions of Rosicrucian, Masonic and Illuminé ceremonies none can be found to tally with the one here given, and it bears every appearance of being fictitious and of having been written for other eyes than those of Talleyrand.

As early as the end of October the expatriated pamphleteer was tiring of his not very satisfactory, and unfruitful mission. Politically there was nothing to be done, the millions of Frederick seemed no nearer the safes of Panchaud's bank, or the linings of Mirabeau's pockets. He writes: "I am full of disgust and lassitude; I appeal to your honor and friendship to tell me what I am, what I am doing, where I am being carried, or to arrange matters so that I may again enjoy freedom. The editors will deal with me more kindly than our rulers do, and I shall not be called on to treat them so tenderly. I will perform anything at the bidding of friendship, but not at that of those in authority, and I should be a great fool to exert myself more in their behalf than they do themselves."

Whenever the irascible exile gave forth threats, Talleyrand, prompted by Calonne as we may guess, poured oil on the troubled waters, as witness the following extract from a letter of the Abbé to Mirabeau in which, if flattery occupies a large place, the proportion of truth must remain highly problematical: "We are more than pleased with your correspondence, as I hear repeated every day. The King reads it with the utmost interest. M. de Calonne thanks you for your promptness, for the care with which your dispatches are drawn; I have laid emphasis on the excellence of your statistical information. The value of your work has been appreciated."

In the month of January, 1787, Mirabeau had come to the final conclusion that he had nothing to hope from either Frederick William or Calonne. He could do nothing more at Berlin. On the 13th of that month he wrote to Talleyrand a letter which shall be the last noticed here and in which occur the following passages:

"Never did kingdom show more symptoms of rapid decline than this. It is being undermined from all sides at once. Sources of revenue cut off; expenses increased; principles out of fashion; public opinion wasted; the army weakened; the few useful men discouraged;

those for whom others have been made discontented, now discontented themselves; all meritorious foreigners sent packing; for the sake of appearing to rule alone only rascallions promoted. . . . I might remain here ten years without giving you any new facts, though doubtless many details. . . . What is to be my function in the future? Nothing useful; but usefulness, and that great, immediate, direct, is the only thing that could make me longer tolerate this ambiguous position. Once more I repeat, what I deserve, what I can do, what I am worth, must now be decided by the King and his ministers. If I neither deserve, nor am capable of accomplishing anything, I am costing the King too much. If I do deserve and if I am capable of anything. . . . I owe it to myself to ask for and to obtain some position, or to go back to my old trade of citizen of the world that will be less fatiguing to body and mind and less unfruitful of fame."

A week later Mirabeau had written the last of his dispatches from Berlin and was on his way to Paris. He had accomplished nothing, but had learned much, and passed a diplomatic apprenticeship that was soon to stand him in good stead. His keen political instinct had detected in the convoking of the Notables of France, then just decided on (perhaps at his advice), the first note of the revolution; the time was fast approaching when his eloquence was to sway the fortunes of King and of people from the tribune of the Assemblée Nationale.

It is uncertain what prompted Mirabeau to publish his correspondence from Berlin two years later. Mr. Welschinger thinks that it was owing to pressure for money, and that would appear the best opinion. But it may be taken as certain that Mirabeau, then on the point of appealing to the people to support him against the Crown, had quite realized the impression these documents would produce of the incapacity of the French ministers and of their diplomatic agents, and also of his own superior ability. Whatever his motives, few who have read the dispatches will defend the act.

No one before Mr. Welschinger had attempted the task he has so successfully accomplished. As an editor, he has left little for a successor to do; it has perhaps been shown that, from the point of view of the historian, there is yet much to be done before the tangle of the hidden threads of the operations, diplomatic, financial, and social, of Mirabeau at Berlin is unravelled.

R. M. JOHNSTON.

THE TURKISH CAPITULATIONS

SINCE the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 the relations of the Western Nations to the Ottoman Empire have been in many respects unique. These relations were determined and defined by decrees of the sultans, who granted large privileges and powers to Europeans resident on their soil. To these decrees in due time the name of Capitulations was given, apparently for the reason that they were divided into articles or chapters. They were personal grants, valid only for the life of the grantor. Hence they were renewed, often with modifications, on the accession of a new sultan. So we find many Capitulations made with France, England and other states. The earliest of these Capitulations, to which reference is now made for authority, is that of 1535, with Francis I. of France. It is more specific and formal than any previous decree. It remained practically in force for 300 years.

It is an interesting fact that concessions similar to those made in the Turkish Capitulations were granted to foreigners in the Orient prior to the establishment of the Ottoman power in the Levant. There is a tradition that ten centuries ago Arab traders were admitted to Canton with permission to erect a mosque, and have a cadi and their own laws;¹ and another that about the same time the califs of Egypt granted similar privileges to the merchants of Amalfi. It is certain that in the Latin colonies in the Greek Empire and on the coast of Africa and of Syria in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the traders from Amalfi and Venice carried with them their local laws and jurisdiction. After the crusades the Frankish barons holding eastern ports sought successfully to attract western trade by releasing it from many of the burdens imposed on it in Italy and France in the form of taxes, imposts, the *droit d'aubaine*, etc. The foreign community or colony was governed under the laws of its own land by a consul, or an official having some other title, but invested with the powers of a magistrate. In the Mussulman states of Northern Africa and the Levant, in the fourteenth century the foreigners of each nation were often gathered in one large establishment with their shops, their chapel and their consular residence. At the same period in the Greek Empire and in Chris-

¹ Travers Twiss in *Revue de Droit International*, 1893, p. 207. Pardessus, *Lois Maritimes*, II., p. cxxxviii.

tian states in Syria the foreigners received sometimes the concession of a whole street or even of a quarter of the city for their churches, residences, mills and baths, and in some cases of lands adjacent to the city. But in all these Oriental states the western merchants had the privilege of extraterritorial jurisdiction. These concessions seem to have been due to a recognition of the wide difference between the eastern and the western civilization, laws, customs and manners, and to have been deemed conducive to the harmonious life of the natives and the foreigners. They were a natural outgrowth of the conditions in which these peoples of diverse origins found themselves and were regarded as no more beneficial to the foreigners than to the natives.

Pradier Fodré, who gave special study to this subject, thinks that the Mohammedans were very ready to grant large privileges to the foreign merchants because of their disinclination to leave their own country for the purposes of trade, and because of their lack of experience in navigation, and their need of attracting foreigners to make use of their extended coast, their fine harbors and their abundant products.¹

As Mohammed II., when he captured Constantinople in 1453, was familiar with these usages, which had been followed in Moslem and Christian seaports of the Levant for three or four centuries, and which on the whole had contributed to the harmony between the natives and the foreigners, it is not surprising that he decided to grant to the foreign residents in his domain substantially the same privileges which they had previously enjoyed. It afforded him the simplest and easiest method of administration. It was for his convenience quite as much as for theirs that he left large liberty to the conquered Greeks, and soon confirmed to the Greeks and Venetians and other nations the privileges they had enjoyed under the old Empire. He was inspired by real statesmanship. It may well be doubted whether he supposed that he was exercising special generosity to the foreign powers.

When Francis I. of France found himself engaged in his great conflict with the Emperor Charles V., he threw aside the scruples which Christian sovereigns had generally entertained against forming an alliance with the Moslems, and sought the friendship of the Sultan Suleiman, who was also opposing the German Emperor. One of the results of this friendship was the granting by the Sultan of what is generally called the First Capitulation. Unhappily the text of this important document is lost. But as we have later Capitulations, which we have every reason to suppose do not differ es-

¹ *Revue de Droit International*, 1869, p. 119.

sentially from the first, we are reasonably sure of its import. It seems to have been in form, not a treaty, but a unilateral document, a grant or concession by the Sultan to his friend, the King of France. It permitted to French subjects the rights of residence, trade and local jurisdiction which have been since 1535 enjoyed by them. The Capitulation which is now generally cited as the basis of the rights claimed by foreigners is that of 1740. Since by Capitulations and later by treaties other nations have received the same rights as "the Franks," all nations refer back to the Capitulation of 1740 to sustain their claims.

The substance of the concessions in the chief Capitulations was as follows: The Franks were to have the liberty to travel in all parts of the Ottoman Empire. They were to carry on trade according to their own laws and usages. They were to have liberty of worship. They were to be free from all duties save customs duties. They were to enjoy inviolability of domicile. Their ambassadors and consuls were to have extraterritorial jurisdiction over them. Even if they committed a crime, they were to be arrested by an Ottoman official only in the presence of a consular or diplomatic official of their own country. The Ottoman officers, if asked by a consular or diplomatic officer to aid in the arrest of a French subject, must render such service. The Franks had the full right of making wills. If they died intestate in Turkey, their own consul must take possession of their property and remit it to their heirs. In fact, the Franks and other nations at last had *imperia in imperio*.

Naturally enough other western powers soon sought to secure the same privileges as France. In 1579 Queen Elizabeth endeavored to secure the favor of the Sultan by reminding him that like him she and her subjects were opposed to the worship of images. This remarkable attempt to show a resemblance between Protestantism and Mohammedanism was not immediately successful in the face of French opposition. But in 1583 the Queen did succeed in establishing relations with the Sultan and appointed William Harenbone ambassador. The Capitulation was afterwards many times renewed. The Netherlands received a Capitulation in 1609, and Austria in 1615.

In 1673 France obtained a new power, namely, the exclusive right of protecting under her flag the subjects of sovereigns who had received no Capitulations. This gave her prestige in Western Europe, and placed several Powers under obligations to her. But in 1675 England after a vigorous effort succeeded in depriving her of the exclusive right of protection of other nations, so that some states, Genoa for instance, had the option of English or French

protection. In 1718 Austria got permission for Genoa and Leghorn to use her flag. The smaller states were for a long time glad to secure the protection of one of the strong Powers.

Perhaps no concession made by the Capitulations to foreign powers has been more abused than the grant of this right of protection. We are all indebted to M. Francis Rey for the thorough study he has made of this subject, and I borrow mainly from him the statements which follow.¹ The French, English and Romans seem to have been especially guilty of abuses of the privilege of taking foreigners under their protection. They sold to native Greeks and Armenians the privilege of protection by a document which exempted them from paying duties on goods imported. Many of these became rich by this advantage, and were allowed to make a transfer of their privilege for a consideration. Ambassadors were allowed to have a large number of dragomans, to each of whom they gave a *barat*, which secured for them valuable exemptions. The ambassadors came to dispose of these appointments or barats for sums ranging from 2500 to 4000 piasters. One of the French ambassadors, it is stated in an official report, received more than 400,000 francs from this source. The English ambassador is said to have received £2000 to £3000 income from the same source. The ambassadors presumed to bestow this barat for life. They used to bribe officials even in the Sultan's household. They went so far as to issue patents of protection to whole families of Greek or Armenian subjects of the Sultan.

Russia and Austria shamefully abused this right of protection for political ends. Rivals in seeking influence in Moldavia and Wallachia in 1780 and 1782, their consuls competed with each other in gratuitously granting patents of protection to the natives. At the close of the last century Austria had by this process more than 200,000 subjects in Moldavia, and 60,000 in Wallachia. But these last were afterwards made Russians by changing the patents, when the Russian influence became preponderant in Wallachia.

In 1806 in order to embarrass Russia Napoleon put an end to the abuse by French ambassadors of the right of issuing the barat to any persons but the dragomans. And Turkey succeeded in persuading most of the foreign Powers to imitate his example. But this did not prevent Russia and Austria and Great Britain, through their consuls, taking large numbers of Turkish rajas under their protection by one pretence or another. In 1808 it is said that Russia had 120,000 Greek subjects of the Sultan, Austria a large number

¹ *La Protection Diplomatique et Consulaire dans les Échelles du Levant et de Barbarie*, par Francis Rey. Paris, 1899.

of Dalmatians and Croats, and Great Britain many Indians and Maltese registered as their *protégés*. Of course they formed lawless crowds claiming exemption from police supervision. Some of the *protégés* were rich merchants, whose acts caused diplomatic conflicts. It is not strange, therefore, that in 1869 the Sultan issued an *iradé* forbidding the naturalization of his subjects under a foreign government unless they had previously obtained his consent. Surely he had been imposed on long enough.

The treaties of this century between Turkey and western Powers are all based on the Capitulations, notably those of 1740. Of late years some important changes have been made. The most noteworthy are these: Down to the nineteenth century foreigners could not hold real property except under borrowed names. Since 1867 they have been allowed to hold it. Duties on imports were formerly only three per cent. Now they are eight per cent., but can be raised only by treaty. Since 1868 the inviolability of the domicile of a foreigner is limited to residences within nine hours' journey of a consular post. Questions of real property are determined in an Ottoman court. Religious freedom is confirmed in all the treaties.

Naturally enough Turkey has made repeated efforts to annul the Capitulations. She tried to do this at the Paris Congress of 1856, and again in 1862. But the Powers generally have been unwilling to yield to her desire. Germany, whose policy for some years has been to secure the favor of the Sultan, renounced the Capitulations ten years ago, but under the most favored nation clause in her treaties retains the same privileges as others.

All the Powers except the United States have surrendered in large degree their extraterritorial jurisdiction over their subjects, though the consul of the subject accused of crime attends his trial, and if injustice is threatened, his case is made a matter of diplomatic consideration.

Our insistence on extraterritorial jurisdiction over our citizens accused of crime now results in the miscarriage of justice. For the Turkish government declines to furnish witnesses, and allows the culprit to escape. It maintains that we have no right to exercise the jurisdiction we claim. It affirms that our copy of the treaty is not correct. There is great need of the adjustment of the question by the negotiation of a new treaty.

We have also a constant source of difficulty with Turkey in respect to naturalized Armenians. Many come to this country and take our naturalization papers and return home as American citizens. But the Sultan recognizes no naturalization since 1869, unless it

has been made by his consent. The British avoid the trouble we have by declaring in writing on the passport of every Turkish subject naturalized in Great Britain that it is not valid on return of the bearer to Turkey.¹

Until the government of Turkey undergoes important improvements, and especially until justice is more impartially administered by her courts, it will not be prudent for the western Powers to make exactly such treaties with her as they may properly make with each other. The difference between the customs and laws of the Mohammedan nations on the one hand and those of the Christian nations on the other is so marked that the relations between the two must long be determined by treaties breathing something of the spirit of the old Capitulations.

JAMES B. ANGELL.

¹ This is in accordance with the following provision in the British Naturalization Act of 1870. "An alien to whom a certificate of naturalization is granted . . . shall not, within the limits of the foreign state of which he was a subject previously to obtaining his certificate of naturalization, be deemed to be a British subject unless he has ceased to be a subject of that state in pursuance of the laws thereof, or in pursuance of a treaty to that effect."

NOMINATIONS IN COLONIAL NEW YORK

FOR the origin of the nominating convention it is necessary to go back to the period which marks the rise of democracy itself—that is, the eighteenth century. The period, that is, which marks the transition from absolutism or aristocracy to democracy will mark also the transition from absolutist or autocratic methods of nomination to democratic methods. In New York this transition was made from a virtual aristocracy to a democracy in the middle and last half of the eighteenth century. It will be necessary therefore to answer the following questions: (1) What were the vital elements in the political life of New York province in the early eighteenth century, and how were nominations made then? (2) When did the transition from aristocracy to democracy begin, and what indications are there of a new method in nominations accompanying this change? (3) To what extent did the new method displace the old before the Revolution?

In 1700 New York was a royal province. Its governmental organization consisted of a governor with his deputy, advised by a council of his own appointment, and a popular assembly which was co-ordinate with the governor and council in legislation. There were established courts of justice and various crown officers besides the governor. But the vital fact in the political history of New York in the early eighteenth century was not the governor, or the council, or the assembly,—was not the organization of the government at all; the vital fact was the existence of a few rich and influential families. Their wealth was based on land and commerce; their influence was the result of ability, social position, and a close organization secured informally by constant, far-sighted, prudential intermarriages. In other words New York was controlled by an aristocracy of wealth and ability, and this control was essentially medieval in its nature—that is, informal and personal. Let us see in more detail how this control was effected, and how, as a part of this control, nominations to elective offices were made.

In the first place, the theatre of operations was small, there were originally but twelve counties¹ covering a narrow strip of

¹ *Colonial Laws of New York* (Albany, 1894), I. 121, 122; *Memorial History of New York*, I. 408. Ostrander, *Brooklyn*, 118.

territory on both sides of the Hudson, and Long Island and Staten Island. The number of counties increased with the population, but they were mostly cut out of the old ones, so that by the time of the Revolution New York, territorially, was practically what it had been at the opening of the century.

But New York was not only territorially small; more important still, what there was of it was largely in the hands of a few men who had benefited by the surviving medieval custom of making large land-grants for personal services. In nearly every county some representative of the coterie of great families held considerable tracts of land and helped to carry out a more or less concerted plan of action. On Staten and Long Island few extensive grants were made during the English period; but even here the most favored ones were men influential in political life—frequently men, such as Smith and Nicolls, whose chief interests were elsewhere.¹ The wealth of the influential families of New York City and County was based upon industry and commerce rather than upon land, though here too some valuable though comparatively small grants were made. New York was nevertheless pre-eminently a commercial city² and the families which were eminent socially and politically make up the roll of her most famous merchant houses. George and Caleb Heathcote, William Smith and William Smith, Jr., the Crugers, one branch of the Livingston family, the Waltons, Alsops, Van Dams,—these were some of the principal merchant families of New York City, and these are names constantly met with in the political history of the province.

But it was northward along the Hudson that the great landed families lived and exercised an influence which was not limited by their own broad estates, but extended throughout the province and was especially powerful in the metropolis, with whose prominent families they were united by ties of interest or of blood-relationship. The largest part of Westchester County was comprised within the six manors located there; and in 1769 it is estimated that at least five-sixths of the inhabitants of the county lived within their bounds.³ In Dutchess County large grants were made to Philipse, Heathcote, Beekman, and Schuyler.⁴ In Albany County the Livingston manor spread over seven modern townships, and the great Van Rensselaer

¹ Bayle's *Suffolk*, 197, 226.

² "New York probably carries a more extensive commerce than any [other] town in the English American provinces." Kalm, *Description of the City of New York in the year 1748*, in *Manual of the Corporation* (1869), 845.

³ De Lancey, *Origin and History of Manors in New York*, in Scharf's *History of Westchester County*, I. 91.

⁴ Smith, *Dutchess County*, 43, 44.

manor stretched twenty-four by twenty-eight miles along the Hudson, while still farther north on the Mohawk were the possessions of Sir William Johnson, whose influence was perhaps greatest of all.¹

The above brief summary will serve to indicate the chief families composing the New York aristocracy of wealth and ability. An extraordinary proportion of the wealth—especially the landed wealth—of the province was in their possession, and of the social position and political influence incidental to such possession they made good use—so good indeed, that their names mark every page of New York history in the first three-quarters of the eighteenth century. How, then, was this aristocracy organized for purposes of political control?

It was organized, according to the wont of aristocracies, informally, by as wide intermarriages as possible. Each man had an "interest" great or small. If he wished to increase it, it was well to have a large family and contrive to make marriage alliances with as many and important families as possible. The family and the family welfare, socially and politically, was the standard. Thus—to note only a few of the most striking examples—the De Peysters were united with the Alexander,² the Van Cortlandt,³ the Schuyler,⁴ and the Livingston⁵ families. The Heathcotes were allied to the Smith⁶ and the De Lancey families,⁷ and through the De Lancey family to the Philipse,⁸ Van Cortlandt,⁹ Schuyler,¹⁰ and Morris¹¹ families. The Livingstons married into the Van Brugh¹² and Duane¹³ families, and were united with the De Peyster¹⁴ and the

¹ Kip, *Olden Time*, 12, 13. For a map showing exact location of landgrants and manors in New York, see *Documentary History of New York* (1849), I.

² Valentine's *Manual* (1857), 556.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Indeed there were few prominent families of the province who were not related in some way to the De Peyster family. At the funeral of Abram De Peyster, Jr., whose death occurred in 1767, the following families were represented among the relatives of the deceased: Van Cortlandt, Beekman, Bancker, Rutgers, Bedlow, Livingston, De Lancey, De La Noy, Lott, Walton, Cruger, Bayard, Clarkson, Van Horne, Philipse, Schuyler, Stuyvesant, Jay, Roosevelt, etc. *Ibid.*

⁶ Valentine's *Manual* (1864), 665. Caleb Heathcote married the daughter of Chief Justice William Smith.

⁷ By the marriage of Anne Heathcote to James De Lancey. *Ibid.*

⁸ Scharf, *Westchester County*, I. 169.

⁹ Valentine, *History of New York*, 243-244.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Memorial History of New York*, IV. 522, 523.

¹³ *Ibid.*, II. 436 n.

¹⁴ Valentine's *Manual* (1861), 556.

Schuyler¹ families, and more or less closely, therefore, with the connections of these.²

Under such circumstances it is clear that any man of ability who had extended his "interest" judiciously might easily come to have a controlling influence within a faction or a party. A kind of feudal hierarchy would be formed. Having attached to his "interest" a number of the most important families, he would secure through each of them a number of others perhaps less important, and so on down. He would have his machine organized on a personal family basis, rather than on an impersonal "spoils" basis, though the spoils element might not be entirely wanting. Practically this is what happened in New York in the eighteenth century. After some fifty years of intermarriage and political control, two families emerged, each with its following, as the leaders in the struggle which was, though political in some degree, after all very largely personal in its nature. These were the Livingston and De Lancey families;³ and that the struggle was personal rather than political is indicated by the fact that the parties were known by the names of their respective leaders.⁴

So much for a landed and commercial aristocracy and its close personal organization; what were some of the conditions in New York which made easy the political control which it exercised? These were: a limited suffrage; infrequent and irregular elections; a small voting population, the relation of a portion of it to the aristocracy, and the manner of voting; general political indifference among the lower classes.

The franchise was limited to freeholders, and to freemen of the

¹ *Memorial History of New York*, IV, 522, 523.

² This far-reaching and complex network of family relationships among the aristocracy has often been noted. "For more than a century these families retained their position, and directed the infant colony. They formed a coterie of their own, and generation after generation married among themselves." Kip, *Olden Time*, 14, 15; *Memorial History of New York*, II, 604 ff; De Lancey, *Origin and History of Manors*, in Scharf's *History of Westchester County*, I, 130. The best notion of the political significance of these intermarriages may be gathered from the letters of Cadwallader Colden. See *Colden Letter-Book*, I, 362, 363, 459, 468, II, 68, 167, 168, 223, 224, 398, 399: in *New York Historical Society Collections*, Fund Series, IX., X.

³ Dawson, *Westchester County during the American Revolution*, 89. *Memorial History of New York*, II, 223, 570. *Colden Letter-Book*, II, 223, 224. No single man in New York had greater influence, perhaps, than Sir William Johnson; but his influence was due rather to other causes, and he seems to have held somewhat aloof from the partisan strife of the Livingstons and the De Lanceys.

⁴ "It may gratify the reader to know that of the members of the Assembly (1752), Mr. Chief Justice De Lancey was nephew to Colonel Beekman, brother to Peter De Lancey, brother-in-law to John Watts, cousin to Philip Verplanck and John Baptist Van Rensselaer; . . . of the whole house the only member neither connected with Mr. De Lancey nor within the sphere of his influence was Mr. Livingston." Smith, *History of New York*, II, 142, 143.

corporations.¹ The elections were held whenever the assembly was dissolved, sometimes at such short notice that the total voting population, such as it was, could not be got to the polls.² But the whole voting population, on account of the limitations of the suffrage, was small. In 1790 the proportion of voters for assemblymen to the total population was approximately twelve per cent.³ Using this as a percentage previous to the Revolution the voting population increased from 2,168 in 1698 to 20,256 in 1771.⁴ This is a liberal estimate too, because the percentage of people of African birth was less in 1791 than during the pre-revolutionary period.⁵ But even so, the voting population was small and therefore proportionately easy to manage. A voting population of from two to twenty thousand, scattered over twelve counties, gave no great difficulty to an aristocracy as coherent and well organized as that of New York province. And this was made easier still by the personal relation of the aristocracy to a portion of the voting population, and by the method of voting. That tenant voters would be largely influenced by lords of manors is perhaps sufficiently obvious. The method of voting, too, contributed to the same end. It was

¹ "Every freeholder within the province and free man in any corporation shall have his free choice and vote in the election of the representatives." *Colonial Laws of New York*, I. iii. Freeholders were defined, by the act of May 16, 1699, to be those who "have lands or tenements improved to the value of forty pounds in freehold free from all incumbrance and have possessed the same three months before the test of the said writ." *Colonial Laws of New York*, I. 405. Quoted in Dawson's *Westchester County during the American Revolution*, 4, note 3. The date given by Dawson is May 8, 1699. Free-men of the New York Corporation were such as had permission to "use any art, trade, mystery, or manual occupation," within the city save in "times of Faires." Extract from Dongan's Charter, April 20, 1686, quoted in *The Burghers of New Amsterdam and the Free-men of New York, 1675-1866*, in *New York Historical Society Collections*, 1885, p. 48. By this charter such persons were to pay, if merchant traders or shop-keepers, three pounds, twelve shillings; if handicraftsmen, one pound, four shillings. *Ibid.*, 49. But at the Common Council for April 24, 1686, the "fee for freedomes" was made five pounds. *Ibid.*, 48. This seems to have been the law until 1784 when a slight modification was made. *Ibid.*, 239, 240. For the list of freemen admitted in New York City from 1686 to 1776, see *ibid.*, 53-238.

Besides the counties, the manors of Rensselaerwick, Livingston, and Cortlandt, and the borough of Westchester, enjoyed the privilege of sending representatives.

² "As to the present election it was appointed so suddenly by the sheriff that it was impossible to collect the votes of this extensive county, particularly as the roads are so bad and the rivers impassable." William Johnson to Dr. Auchmuty, Jan. 25, 1769. Johnson's MSS., XVII. 51.

³ Based upon "a census of the electors and inhabitants of the State of New York taken in the year 1790." (Broadside in the Library of the New York Historical Society, Vol. I. of the collection) and a "List of electors in New York state for the assembly, reported by a committee of the House, Jan. 27, 1791." (Greenleaf's *Journal*, Jan. 27, 1791.)

⁴ This estimate is made on the basis of statistics presented in the *Documentary History of New York* (1849), I. 689-697.

⁵ *Ibid.*

throughout *viva voce*; every man voted in full knowledge of the candidates and of the powerful leaders.¹ A voter could not be independent in secret; by his vote he proclaimed to the world in whose "interest" he stood. Every voter was watched, we may be sure, and his record was known.² In addition to this the widespread political indifference among the common people, in the rural districts at least, made political control by the aristocracy still more easy.³

By whom, then, and how were nominations made as a part of this political control? They were made practically by the controlling members of the aristocracy, informally and personally. Strictly speaking there was no *method*—nominations were methodless. This assertion rests largely on a lack of evidence rather than on a wealth of it. The very fact that there is scarcely any evidence left to us of how nominations were made tends to show that there was no formal method—tends to show in the light of the conditions just enumerated, that candidates were "set up" by some form of private personal agreement among the two or three men within a county whose "interests" were sufficient to decide the election. Their stand once taken, all who were in their "interest" followed their lead as a matter of course, for this is the essence of the aristocratic method, that men are governed by personality rather than by principle. The question in Albany was not, what are the candidate's principles, but whom is Sir William or Col. Livingston for?

But although the lack of evidence tends to show that this was true because this fashion of selecting candidates, above all others, would leave little trace save in private correspondence, what evidence there is tends to confirm it; and that little is to be gleaned from such correspondence. What has been said of the old aristocracy

¹ The method of taking a poll is detailed by the law of May 16, 1699, *Colonial Laws of New York*, I. 406 ff. See also De Lancey, Manors of New York, in Scharf's *History of Westchester County*, I. 110. The best notion of what a colonial election was like can be obtained from a description of the election of Lewis Morris to the Assembly from Westchester County in 1733. *New York Journal*, Nov. 5, 1733; quoted in Bolton, *History of Westchester County*, I. 136-139; and given in substance in the *Memorial History of New York*, II. 233.

² A wealthy and influential member of the aristocracy could be opposed by a common man only with some temerity. The view taken of such opposition is well illustrated in the closing lines of the description of the election of Lewis Morris in 1733. "Upon the closing of the poll, the other candidate, Forster, and the Sheriff, wished the late Chief Justice much joy. Forster said he hoped the late judge would not think the worse of him for setting up against him, to which the judge replied, he believed he was put up against his inclinations, but that he was highly blameable." *New York Journal*, Nov. 5, 1733.

³ Dawson, *Westchester County during the American Revolution*, I, ff. Clute, *Staten Island*, 82.

cratic method of making nominations can readily and most fitly be illustrated by extracts taken from the manuscript letters and papers of Sir William Johnson.¹

In May, 1745, the Assembly was dissolved for lack of respect to the governor,² and in the election which followed the services of Sir William were enlisted by the governor, who wished a certain Mr. Holland returned for Schenectady.³ Not long after we find Mr. Holland himself soliciting the aid of his patron thus:⁴ "there is a barrell of the flour wanting, which I suppose Peter left behind him. Your interest in the [ensu]ing election at Schenectady for a representative is desired for your [frie]nd and servt. . . . E. H."

Three years later another election occurred. In such a county as Albany the centre of political activity was naturally at the city of Albany, and most of the candidates came from there. That this was often a ground of complaint by outlying districts we may well believe. In this election of 1748 indeed the farmers of Canajoharie were up in arms, threatening to set up a candidate of their own. The following document will explain how the matter was settled through the influence of Johnson.⁵

"Messers.

"Considering how troublesome and inconvenient it would be to all the farmers to have an election at this time of the year, I went immediately to Albany to see to make it up easy now without any trouble. Philip Schuyler and Hans Hansen were sett up by the people of Albany, so I sent for them, and told them if they would do their best for the government of the country we would not sett up anybody against them now, but if they would not do good now for the country we would set up others next time, whereupon they promised me they would do what they could. . . . Now gentlemen and friends I thank you all heartily for your good will for me, as well as if you had voted every bit. I hope when there is another election you will be all as one body to stand by me and put in other good men if these wont do good for us now. For my part I am resolved as I live here to stand by you all for the good of the whole

¹ Sir William Johnson was one of the most influential members of the New York aristocracy. His influence in the northern counties was especially great. On this point see a letter from the Revolutionary committee of the Palatine District of Tryon County, May 18, 1775, *American Archives*, fourth series, II. 637; and Campbell's *Tryon County*, 29.

The letters and papers of Sir William Johnson in twenty-six volumes are in the State Library at Albany. They have been calendared and indexed. Vols. I.-XXII. contain letters and papers arranged chronologically from 1738 to 1774. Vols. XXIII.-XXV. contain letters and papers arranged chronologically from 1733 to 1775. Vol. XXVI. contains private business papers. I am indebted to the courtesy of the head of the Manuscript Department of the State Library for the use of these papers.

² Stone, *Life of Sir William Johnson*, I. 157.

³ *Ibid.*, 188.

⁴ E. H. to Sir William Johnson, June 7, 1745. Johnson MSS., XXIII. 11.

⁵ Johnson MSS., XXIII. 78. This document is in the handwriting of Johnson.

river and hope we will always be true to one another. I am with hearty thanks for all your good will, your true friend and well wisher.

W. J.

To all the Messers of Canajoharie."

This document speaks with no uncertain note of the personal influence of Sir William, at least over the farmers of Canajoharie. But his influence, as we shall see, was not limited to the Mohawk region: it was almost if not quite as great in other parts of the county, and even in the city of Albany itself his name was one to conjure with. "It may easily be seen," writes a correspondent from Albany two years later,¹ "that the intention of the heads here in general are (*sic*) for putting in Coll: Schuyler and Peter Winne, who with their party here work very hard from morning till night and Mr. Collins sends letters to all parts of the county. Mr. De Peyster is very diligent—whether for himself or others is yet a secret to your friends who long to see you here and say if you appeared it would make a great alteration for they confess it is in our power to turn the skeals if you take it in hand."

Factional contests became increasingly sharp towards the time of the Revolution: as early as 1761 competition for the assembly-seat in Albany County had become keen and a number of men were ready to set themselves up. For most of them it seemed desirable, for some it seemed essential, to get the support of Sir William Johnson. The old-members, we are told,² "propose to advertise themselves this day without the advise of any one of the citizens." But although they may have ignored the magnates of Albany, it does not appear that they found it wise altogether to neglect Johnson. On the same day we find one of them, at least, seeking his aid for the office.³ "As the gentlemen here in town propose to set us up for Representatives for the city and County of Albany, and if its agreeable to you we beg your Interest, in which you'll very much oblige us. We remain respectfully, sir," etc.³ A third party determined to run Abraham Yates, the late sheriff, who was, they assured Sir William, "a very good man," and was likely to have "a pretty strong interest," but, "nevertheless we should be glad to know your Inclinations, as we are certain they would be supported by both the manors of Rensselaer and Livingston."⁴

The next election—the last but one in the colonial period—came

¹ Richard Miller to William Johnson, July 3, 1750. Johnson MSS., XXIII, 121.

² David Van der Heyden to William Johnson, Feb. 3, 1761. Johnson MSS., V, 38. The old members were Jacob Ten Eyck and Peter Winne.

³ Jacob Ten Eyck and Volkert P. Dow to William Johnson, Feb. 3, 1761. *Ibid.*, 37.

⁴ David Van der Heyden to William Johnson, Feb. 3, 1761. *Ibid.*, 38.

in the spring of 1768.¹ James Butler, a friend of Sir William's, kept the latter informed of the various candidates. But most people, he writes,² "believe that those you [des]ire will carry the point: there are some that are very faint-hearted, knowing your Interest to be too great for their [strength]."³ Early in January the report got abroad that Sir William intended to set up a candidate of his own from the Mohawk district—a report which created some consternation at Albany, and occasioned many conjectures and many meetings. The common opinion was that Sir John Johnson must be the intended candidate. For the friends of Sir William, who were constantly urging him to active conflict with the Albany faction, this was good news. "If there is any such intention," writes Cartwright, from Albany,⁴ "should be very glad to know it. You may depend on the Interest of Cuyler's family, of Hanson's, and many more, who would be glad to know it. Whatever Interest or connection I have you may command in that or anything else." But the rumor was merely a rumor, for we are told that neither "myself nor Sir John had the least thought of his setting up;" but Sir William, nevertheless, had "some reason to think that I could have carried the county without much difficulty."⁵

The last election in New York province came the next year, 1769, and was for the most part only a continuation of the struggle begun the year before. No previous elections were more bitterly contested.⁶ In Albany, as in most places, the personal element was

¹ Meanwhile between the elections of 1761 and 1768 Johnson received a letter from Schenectady, which throws interesting light on the method, or lack of method, in nominations, which prevailed at that time. "I have been thinking on what has for some time passed been advised, which is that I should become a candidate to represent the township in Assembly whenever a vacancy happened, and as my becoming a member . . . might be a means to settle all party affairs here, I shall . . . have no objection in so doing, provided you approve and will favor me with your Interest . . . otherwise I will think no more of it . . . on the other hand, if you think it right I will endeavor with my other friends to make what Interest I can . . . although I am sensible that your Interest alone can do it." John Duncan to William Johnson, Nov. 19, 1763. Johnson MSS., VII. 252.

² James Butler to William Johnson, Dec. 12, 1767. Johnson MSS., XV. 173.

³ Benjamin Cartwright to William Johnson, Jan. 8, 1768. Johnson MSS., XV. 228.

⁴ William Johnson to Hugh Wallace, April 8, 1768. Johnson MSS., XVI. 66.

⁵ The new issues which were coming to the front were cutting into the old factions and separating families long connected by political and social ties. The rupture between the Colden and Clinton families is an example. There is an interesting letter among the George Clinton papers, from the young Cadwallader Colden to George Clinton, relative to this rupture, which throws so much light on the political methods of the time that it is worth reproducing at length.

"Coldingham, Jan. 11, 1769.

"Sir. The heats and animosities created by the last election in this part of the county (and that too among the most intimate acquaintances . . .) gave me such concern that I can't but say that I am truly sorry there is now an opportunity for the renew-

still predominant. Philip Schuyler, one of the old members, owed his position, partially at least, to the interest of Johnson, whose support he had asked at former elections,¹ and his re-election now depended not upon his attitude toward current political questions, but upon his personal relations with Sir William. "I assure you," writes Hugh Wallace,² "this gentleman behaved very badly here, and I am told spoke of you at the Indian Congress with some disrespect. I got into his company and introduced a discourse about that affair, but his tone was different or, by God, his bones would have paid for it. I think you ought to exert your Interest that he should not be returned." The zealous partisan of Sir William goes on to suggest that Sir John be returned in Schuyler's stead, not because Sir John was a fitter man, but because "it would give great pleasure to many of your sincere friends;" at any rate, "as you have it in your power to send who (*sic*) you please for Albany county, I wish you would stop Coll: Schuyler, and I think you might send a fitter man than poor Myndertse for Schenectady." Johnson replied to Wallace on January 25, stating that he had only recently heard of the "particular you mention with regard to Philip Schuyler." Since then he had received a polite note from Schuyler and the other candidate "requesting my interest again, on which I immediately wrote him as I ought with regard to the report I had heard which he has denied or endeavored to explain away. However I think it necessary to take

ing or continuing those fermentations. . . . I cant question you, for your part, being a ready to promote any scheme that may have a tendency to unite this end of the county again and to restore that friendship that has so long subsisted between you and my father's family; and I see but one way at present likely to bring this about; and that is to think of a third person for candidate for this end of the county who was not mentioned in the last election, and consequently not of either party, and such a one there happens to be even within the county,—Mr. Peter Du Bois. Perhaps this will appear to be your son's forsaking his friends and the party he joined at the other end of the county. I cant think this objection of sufficient weight when it is considered that Mr. Du Bois (if of any) must be of the same party. Besides I should leave the people of this end of the county entirely to themselves with regard to the choice of the other member. As a lover of peace and concord I now offer these things to your consideration. I am sensible that it is as little for the private benefit of your son to be in the assembly as it would be for me, and therefore if the influence which one or two gentlemen in New York has over him is such as to put a reconciliation with me out of the question I shall then ever know what to depend upon and perhaps things may take a different turn from what he expects. . . . A little reflection, I think, must induce you to use your influence with your son to comply with [these] proposals. The weight they have with you and him will ever after determine how much I shall be, Sir,

Your Humble Serv't,
CAD' COLDEN JUN^R.³

George Clinton Papers, I. 11.

¹ William Johnson to the Rev. Dr. Auchmuty, Jan. 25, 1769. Johnson MSS., XVII. 51.

² Hugh Wallace to William Johnson, Jan. 7, 1769. *Ibid.*, 32.

the first opportunity of a personal explanation as he writes in such a manner that *it would not be altogether justifiable in me to condemn him at once.*¹ Unless this is an exaggerated account of Sir William's influence—and it very likely is to some extent—he seems to have had as sure a grip on Albany County as any modern boss could well have. The difference lies here: the personal influence of a modern boss is secret, working through an open formal organization, and based upon the control of the spoils; the personal influence of Sir William was open, working through a private informal organization, and based to a very considerable extent upon personal attachment. Sir William was not a boss, he was a patron.

If this serves to show what the nature of the aristocratic method of nomination was, it also indicates to what extent this method prevailed down to the Revolution. It is now necessary to retrace our steps and search for the beginnings of the democratic method.

The period from 1730 to 1750 in New York discovers a marked advance in material prosperity and in scientific and literary activity; it is in some senses a renaissance period, having its basis in a growing democratic spirit, a coming consciousness of equality.² It is here we must look for the origin of the nominating convention, which is an incident in the growth of this democratic spirit. The nominating convention is an incident in

¹ William Johnson to Hugh Wallace, January 25, 1769. Johnson MSS., XVII. 52. The same sentiments are expressed in a letter to John Watts, January 26, 1769. *Ibid.*, 56; and in a letter to the Rev. Dr. Auchmuty, who must have made a similar request, he says, "As to the person you particularly mention, he applied to me at his first entrance into the House, and as I had nothing then to urge against him, I made no stir, nor had he any opponents. If his conduct since will justify me, I shall at another opportunity do what is needful, as I have the pleasure to find that conduct which gives me inward satisfaction has produced me an Influence and Interest in this country which it is not in their power to deprive me of." William Johnson to Dr. Auchmuty, January 25, 1769. *Ibid.*, 51. For a more complete account of the trouble between Johnson and Schuyler, see the letter from John Wetherhead to William Johnson January 9, 1769. *Ibid.*, XXV. 125.

² Judge Jones in his history calls 1750 the golden age in New York and all modern writers have agreed in ascribing to this period a decided intellectual activity, compared, at least, with what preceded. See *Memorial History of New York*, II. 230, 448 ff. 631, 632; III. 115. To be convinced that it was a period of growing democratic consciousness it is only necessary to look through the newspapers and broadsides of the time, and follow through the political discussions which arose, remembering always that this was the logical outcome of the previous years of conflict between the lower house and the governors—between the representatives of the people in the colony and the representatives of the government in England. For example, a broadside, dated September 28, 1736, says, relative to the Van Dam-Clarke controversy, "Every freeman has a right to declare who is entitled to the government and it is no crime in a free one, though it may be in France or Spain. . . . Let every man declare boldly who he thinks entitled, Van Dam or Clarke, and the Corporation it is supposed will act according to the directions of their constituents." Vol. I., of a collection of broadsides in the Library of the New York Historical Society. See other broadsides in the same collection.

the effort of the masses to pull down authority from the top and place it on the ground—an instrument by which they try to get vital control of the business of governing. One thing which aided them in this effort—which was in truth partially the result of it, but which in turn reacted upon it and powerfully confirmed it—was the establishment of newspapers, the extension of printing generally, and the consequent struggle for freedom of speech and the press.¹ In the face of this growing democratic spirit, the very essence of which is individual initiative, the great families found their influence growing weaker, found it less possible to hold a following by mere force of personality. As men came more and more to have opinions of their own and to express them through the newspapers and broadsides, or at least imbibed such opinion as others were thus expressing, the leaders found it increasingly necessary to win over their "Interests" to every measure and every ticket, by force of reason, or what passed for reason, rather than by force of personality. This is simply saying that when men learn that they may have opinions on political questions with *reasons* for them, some broadly generalized theory of political right, or governmental policy, or social change, instead of some powerful personality, will claim their allegiance. This was happening in New York during the middle and last half of the eighteenth century, and the change was followed there as everywhere by the disintegration of old followings, the increase of factions, general political heterodoxy. The old leaders therefore found themselves increasingly under the necessity of extending their influence and harmonizing thought and action, not merely over the field of a narrow oligarchic aristocracy, each member of which was sure of his own following, but over the whole field of those who were politically interested. Marriage alliances, which had been the means for effecting the informal personal organization of the aristocratic period, were no longer efficient or practicable; one could not marry the whole world, and, besides, marriage was a personal bond only; marrying into a man's family did not mean marrying into his principles, much less the principles of all of the members of that family. The thing that had to be done therefore was this: this growing anarchy of opinion, of individual initiation, had to be harmonized, organized, centralized in a formal and public manner on the basis of principle, instead of, as formerly,

¹ Printing was first introduced into New York in 1693 by William Bradford. He also established the first newspaper in New York, the *New York Gazette*, which dates from the fall of 1725. Of more importance in this connection was the establishment of Zenger's *New York Journal*, in 1733, as the avowed organ of the popular party. Popular sentiments were freely expressed in this somewhat rabid sheet, and in numerous broadsides which Zenger made a business of printing and circulating.

in a personal private manner on the basis of leadership. Practically we find just this thing happening in New York at this time—the beginnings of the association of individuals, in a more or less public manner, with little in common but their political views, and with no other aim than the accomplishment of a definite political purpose.

I shall now try to illustrate the beginnings of this new method in the period before the Revolution. That these beginnings should be more marked in the cities than in the country, needs, perhaps, no explanation.

As early as 1739 the freeholders and freemen of New York City were informed that "Whereas a great number of the freeholders and freemen of the said city have agreed and resolved to choose the following persons to represent them, to wit: [four names follow]. Your vote and interest are desired . . . at the ensuing election."¹ Though this does not necessarily imply an actual meeting of a formal nature, it does imply an agreement of some sort, and, what is more important, indicates the growing authority of common men in such matters when acting jointly. Likewise at the election of 1743 "a great number of inhabitants," we are told, agreed in a similar manner to support a certain ticket.² Notices of a like nature became more common at the succeeding elections.³

At this time too the practice of writing letters and addresses to the freeholders and publishing them in the newspapers and in broadsides became common. In these addresses the issues were discussed more or less intelligently, the candidates criticized, and information freely given as to the rights of citizens, the duties of legislators and the qualities which it was desirable that public servants should have.⁴ In all of these can be clearly seen the tendency toward organization in a more formal way and on the basis of common political notions.

¹ The *New York Gazette*, Feb. 20-27, 1739. Copied in Valentine's *Manual of the Corporation* (1865), 744.

² Valentine's *Manual* (1865), 751.

³ *New York Post Boy*, Dec. 21, 1747; Valentine's *Manual* (1865), 821; *New York Gazette*, July 30, 1850; Valentine's *Manual* (1866), 643, 667. An amusing squib, entitled, "Political Bill of Mortality," taken from the papers of William Livingston, is printed by Sedgwick in his *Memoir of the Life of William Livingston* (1833), 65. It states that in the month of August, 1750, there were in all 110 political deaths in New York City, three dying "of nocturnal consultations," fourteen "of running about for votes," etc.

⁴ These addresses are too long to be reproduced in full. The *New York Gazette* of Jan. 18, 1748, contains one of three columns, signed, "Freeholder." The author argues against the present members, whom, he finds, it is intended to return. A reply is printed in the same paper, Jan. 25, in which the present members are supported. Such communications become more and more frequent from 1750. Newspapers and broadsides constituted, so to say, the forum of political discussion.

A little later¹ there are some indications of half-clandestine meetings in the nature of caucuses. At first the evidence of these meetings comes in the form of ridicule and burlesque—an indication probably that they had not been at all frequent before.² In spite of ridicule, however, these meetings tended necessarily to become more frequent and to take on more and more an open and public character. This need for formal organization found expression also in the foundation of the "Whig Club" in 1752, under the direction of the leaders of the Livingston party.³ The club was composed of William Livingston, William Smith, Jr., and John Morin Scott. They met "once in each week at the popular tavern of the King's Arms," and, we may imagine, served as well as possible the purposes for which county and state central committees now exist. Passing over much that would serve still further to illustrate the growing publicity and the tendency toward formal organization in methods of nomination, it will be sufficient perhaps to indicate the stage which had been reached in this development at the last formal elections in 1768 and 1769.

By 1768 the practice of self-nomination had already begun to excite adverse comment;⁴ for self-nomination was a survival of the old system in that it implied a more or less private and secret agreement behind . . . It was now passing away as these private agreements were changing into formal public meetings which did their own nominating. By this time, too, the publication of long and elaborate letters and addresses in newspapers and handbills, had come to be a firmly established practice,⁵—a practice to which we

¹ See burlesque in *New York Gazette*, Feb. 3, 1752. In same connection see *ibid.*, Feb. 17.

² *Memorial History of New York*, II. 346. The King's Arms Tavern was located on the northeast corner of Broad and Dock (now Pearl) streets, opposite "Black Sam" Fraunces's tavern. The building was destroyed in 1890; the old Fraunces tavern building is still standing.

³ *New York Mercury*, Feb. 15, 22, 1768.

⁴ See broadside entitled, "The Watchman No. 1," in the New York Historical Society library, Vol. I. of the collection. The article is an attack on the De Lancey family and belongs to the year 1768. See also an address to "The Freeholders and Freemen of the City and County of New York" in the same collection. It probably belongs to the election of 1768 or 1769. The author descants on the blessings of representative government, and exhorts the freeholders to choose men of "Sincerity and Probability and Capacity." He would exact from candidates a declaration "that they will not accept any office of honor or profit under the government . . . while they represent you; that they will do all in their power to get an agent appointed at the court of Great Britain . . . At all events choose men of ability and no Boys." See also, same collection, broadside entitled, "To the Citizens of New York on the present critical situation of affairs," etc. The Lenox Library collection of broadsides of this period and later has been conveniently described and summarized in the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, Jan., 1899, pp. 23 ff.

look back for the origin of our present convention platforms. But it was not until the final election in the spring of the next year that the new method clearly assumed its first distinctive form—the formal public mass-meeting; by a glance at this election we may perceive how far the new method had developed before the Revolution.

The questions at issue in both elections were for the most part the same. At bottom was the old Livingston-De Lancey rivalry; on the side of Livingston were ranged the dissenters, the lawyers, and the radical anti-British party, while the Church, the merchants, and the compromisers stood by De Lancey. Nevertheless the old personal rivalries were giving way before the coming life-and-death questions of British control, which were cutting into the old factions and rapidly reorganizing parties on a basis of principle instead of on a basis of leadership. This tendency is clearly to be seen in the election of 1769, at the very time when the new methods in nomination are first coming prominently to the front.

The result of the bitter personal contest of 1768 was the election of one member of the Livingston party, Philip Livingston himself, and three of the De Lancey party, James De Lancey, James Jauncey, and Jacob Walton. As the election of 1769 approached, Livingston determined not to be a candidate at all unless there could be a "peaceful election." With other members of his party, therefore, he addressed a letter to De Lancey and Walton, deplored the religious dissensions and proposing a temporary union of the parties by the nomination of a joint ticket, each party naming two candidates.¹ This proposition was rejected, but on January 4 the De Lancey party held a meeting at the Exchange, where they nominated De Lancey, Jauncey, and Walton, and sent a messenger to Livingston offering to make him the fourth member.² Livingston having declined this proposal, the meeting proceeded to fill out their ticket with the name of John Cruger, the mayor.³ The Livingston party had its meeting the very same day, and notwithstanding Livingston's refusal to stand as a candidate for either party unless a compromise could be arranged, proceeded to form a ticket of which he was the head, the others being Peter V. Livingston, Theodorus Van Wyck, and John Morin Scott.⁴ These meetings, it is related, consisted of some hundreds of inhabitants.⁵ They were of course

¹ Sedgwick, *Memoir of William Livingston*, 146, 147. The statement of Sedgwick is based upon a broadside in the New York Public Library. See also the statement of Philip Livingston, *New York Mercury*, Jan. 9, 1769.

² *Memorial History of New York*, II. 396; *New York Mercury*, Jan. 9, 1769.

³ *New York Mercury*, Jan. 9, 1769.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Memorial History of New York*, II. 396.

mere mass-meetings and unorganized, but the unorganized mass-meeting leads directly to the organized nominating convention.

Thus while the old method, previous to the Revolution, retained its hold rather firmly in the rural districts and the upper counties, the new method had attained its first distinctive form, at least within the city of New York. The Revolution itself gave a powerful impetus to the new method, and practically destroyed the old. It destroyed the old by breaking up and driving out the old aristocracy; gave a great impetus to the new by teaching a minority the uses of formal organization—mass-meetings, committees, resolutions, chairmanships, and rules of order. When the Revolution was over, and the new elective offices were to be filled, these lessons were not forgotten.

CARL BECKER.

THE LEGEND OF MARCUS WHITMAN

FAMILIAR as the student of history is with the growth of legend, it is frequently assumed that these products of fancy develop only in the absence of documents and contemporary records; or that, if they do invade the field of authenticated history, it is only to clothe the bare limbs of fact with the foliage of picturesque incident or winged words: Columbus stands the egg on its end, or Galileo mutters "*e pur si muove.*" History is full of such touches, which if not true are not essential distortions of the train of events. For examples of the complete legendary reconstruction of history we naturally turn to the Middle Ages or earlier periods, and call to mind the Donation of Constantine or the story of William Tell. That such a reconstruction of history should take place in the latter half of the nineteenth century in the United States and should involve an event of such immense importance and world-wide publicity as the acquisition of Oregon will seem little short of incredible. To trace the steps by which the imaginative reconstruction of this transaction, strangely distorting the relative significance of men and events, has slowly but steadily pushed aside the truth, until it has invaded not only the text-books but the works of historians whose reputation gives their utterances a certain authority, would give every one a new idea of the pervasive and subtle power of the legendary faculty of the human mind and of the need of unceasing critical vigilance.¹

¹ Its first appearance in a formal history was in W. H. Gray's *History of Oregon, 1792-1849, Drawn from Personal Observation and Authentic Information*, Portland, Oregon, 1870. Von Holst mentions it in 1881 (*Const. Hist. of the U. S.*, III. 51, 52), with some hesitation. It is taken from Von Holst by Lyon G. Tyler, *Letters and Times of the Tylers*, Richmond, Va., 1885, II. 439, and presented with some corrective comments. The period of its widest diffusion and general acceptance, however, begins in 1883 with the publication of Barrows's *Oregon*. Thence it has passed into magazine and newspaper articles and text-books. See McMaster's *With the Fathers*, N. Y., 1896, the chapter entitled "The Struggle for Territory," pp. 307-310; McMaster's *School History of the U. S.*, 1897, pp. 32-34; J. W. Foster's *Century of American Diplomacy*, 1900, p. 305; J. W. Burgess's *The Middle Period*, 1897, pp. 314-316; the school histories of Scudder, Thomas, Montgomery, and Gordy, also the *Encycl. Brit.* as well as the American Supplement and *The International Cycl.*, arts. Oregon.

In O. W. Nixon's *How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon*, Chicago, 1895, all the legendary elements are combined with some genuine material, but the author is either ignorant of or suppresses essential facts. Eva Emery Dye's *McLoughlin and Old Oregon*, Chicago, 1900, adds new fictitious materials. This book is hardly more than an

To enable the reader to follow a critical investigation of how Marcus Whitman saved Oregon to the United States, a brief outline of the story must be given.

About the first of October 1842, while Dr. Whitman was dining at a trading-post of the Hudson's Bay Company at Fort Walla Walla the news comes of the arrival of a colony of Canadians from the Red River country. The assembled company is jubilant and a young priest cries out "Hurrah for Oregon! America is too late, and we have got the country." Whitman realizes that if Canadian immigration has really begun the authorities at Washington ought to know it, and a counter American immigration ought to be promoted, so that when the joint occupation of Oregon is terminated, the presence of a majority of American settlers may turn the balance in favor of the United States by right of possession. The government must be informed as to the value of Oregon and its accessibility by overland emigration. In spite of the protests of his fellow missionaries, he immediately starts for Washington, where he arrives March 2, 1843, most opportunely to secure the postponement of negotiations looking to the surrender of Oregon by pledging himself to demonstrate the accessibility of the country by conducting thither a thousand immigrants, which he does during the ensuing summer.¹

The essential points in this statement are the cause and purpose of Dr. Whitman's journey to the East in 1842, his influence on the Oregon policy of the government and his organization of the great immigration of 1843. Incidental or collateral assumptions usually accompany this statement to the effect that great ignorance and indifference in regard to Oregon prevailed in Washington and generally throughout the United States, and that Dr. Whitman was able to dispel the ignorance and to transform the indifference into a deep and widespread interest. In both the essentials and the explanatory details the story of how Marcus Whitman saved Oregon is fictitious. It is not only without trustworthy contemporary evidence, but is irreconcilable with well established facts. No traces of knowledge

historical romance. It is a most curious fact that although Bancroft's *Oregon*, which was published in 1885, contains a well digested and true account of the causes of Whitman's journey and his connection with the emigration of 1843, all carefully authenticated from contemporary sources, it has been entirely neglected by the authors of the books above mentioned.

My eyes were first opened to the intricacies and curious origin of the legend by a very careful investigation conducted under my supervision by one of my students, Mr. Arthur Howard Hutchinson. His study of the question convinced him that there was a larger amount of collusion and purpose in developing and disseminating the story than I have thought it best to try to prove in this article.

¹ Cf. Barrows's *Oregon*, p. 160 ff.; McMaster, *With the Fathers*, pp. 307-310.

of it have ever been found in the contemporary discussion of the Oregon question. The story first emerges over twenty years after the events and seventeen years after Whitman's death and its conception of the Oregon policy of the government is that handed down by tradition in an isolated and remote community. Criticism of a simple type has winnowed out some of the crudest misconceptions, unconscious that more is needed to substantiate a narrative than to sift out its impossibilities.¹

The real cause of Dr. Whitman's journey to the East was the decision of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to discontinue the southern branch of the mission, and his purpose was to secure a reversal of that order, and reinforcements from the Board, and to bring back, if possible, a few Christian families. The rapidly increasing immigration into Oregon made an increase of Protestant missions essential if Oregon was to be saved from becoming Catholic.

Owing to difficulties of the work among the small and widely scattered groups of Indians and to dissensions among the missionaries of the Oregon missions the Prudential Committee of the American Board passed the following resolution, February 23, 1842: "That the Rev. Henry H. Spalding be recalled, with instructions to return by the first direct and suitable opportunity; that Mr. William H. Gray be advised to return home, and also the Rev. Asa B. Smith, on account of the illness of his wife; that Dr. Marcus Whitman and Mr. Cornelius Rogers be designated to the northern branch of the mission; and that the two last named be authorized to dispose of the mission property in the southern branch of the mission."²

This action of the Prudential Committee was discussed at the meeting of the Oregon Mission, September 26, 1842. Mr. Gray requested that he might be released to establish a boarding-school under the auspices of the Hudson's Bay Company's officials, which was refused. On the 28th it was

"Resolved: That if arrangements can be made to continue the operations of this station, that Dr. Marcus Whitman be at liberty and advised to visit the United States as soon as practicable to confer with

¹ Cf. Burgess, *The Middle Period*, pp. 315-316, and Eells, *History of Indian Missions*, Philadelphia, 1882. On pp. 43-46, Mr. Eells tells the true history of Whitman's journey East and then on pp. 162-176 the full legendary account, omitting only such details as are obviously irreconcilable with the records of the Board!

² Records of the Prudential Committee of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, at the Congregational House, Boston. Cf. *The Missionary Herald*, Jan. 1843, p. 14, and the *Report* of the A.B.C.F.M. for 1842, p. 194.

the committee of the A.B.C.F.M. in regard to the interests of this mission."¹

E. WALKER, moderator.
CUSHING EELLS, Scribe,
H. H. SPALDING."²

On October 3, 1842, Mr. Walker wrote to the Board a long letter regarding the work in Oregon, urging them to keep up the missions for the benefit of the incoming white settlers as well as for the Indians for whom they had been established. "With this view of the case," he writes :

" You will see why we were unwilling to abandon the South branch, for as it seemed to us, by giving that up we were giving up the whole mission. Notwithstanding we thought that the object of your letter had been accomplished by the reconciliation which had taken place, still we felt ourselves placed in a trying situation, we hardly knew what course to pursue, but concluded to wait until we could receive an answer to the committee [communication?]³ of the mission stating that the difficulties of the mission were settled. We found too that there was a difficulty in sustaining the mission as so many had withdrawn and as the reinforcements had stopped at the Islands [Hawaiian Islands]. After considerable consultation without coming to any definite conclusion and as we were about starting for our place, a proposition was made by Dr. Whitman for him to return to the States this winter to confer with the Prudential Committee and conduct a reinforcement out next summer if it was thought best to continue the mission. At least something definite could be decided upon. The proposition being presented just as we were on the eve of leaving we felt at first that we could not then give a decided answer to it. We wanted him to think and pray over it and proposed we return and send in writing our conclusion. But we were told that there was no time to be lost, that we must decide it now, or it would be too late. After some more consultation, we stated that if the station could be put in a situation which would render it safe to be left and after proper arrangements could be made, we would consent to Dr. Whitman's going to the States. We do not approve of the hasty manner in which this question was decided. Nothing it seemed to us but stern necessity induced us to decide on the manner we did. It seemed death to put the proposition in force and worse than death to remain as we were. I have

¹ From letter-book "Oregon Indians" in the records of the Board. The letter is dated: "Waiilatpu, Oct. 3rd, 1842," and endorsed "Rec'd. 30 Mar. 1843." For the action of the mission see *Miss. Herald*, Sept. 1843, p. 356, also *Report of the A.B.C.F.M.*, 1843, p. 169.

The statement in Mr. Walker's diary, under date of September 28, is: "At breakfast the Dr. let out what was his plan in view of the state of things. We persuaded them to get together and talk matters over. I think they felt some better afterwards. Then the question was submitted to us of the Dr.'s going home which we felt that it was one of too much importance to be decided in a moment, but finally came to the conclusion if he could put things at that station in such a state we could consent to his going and with that left them and made a start for home." From the MS. in the possession of the Oregon State Historical Society.

² The word is "committee" in my transcript, but it may be an error in copying.

no doubt if his plan succeeds it will be of great good to the mission and the country."¹

This letter was endorsed by Cushing Eells: "I am happy to say that the subjects of this letter have been frequently discussed of late by Mr. Walker and myself. I do not now recollect that there has been any important difference in the conclusions arrived at." Mr. Spalding wrote from Clearwater, October 15, a letter of twenty quarto pages in answer to the letter of the Board of February 26, 1842.² It is a reply to the charges preferred against him and contains not a word about Whitman's journey. Mr. W. H. Gray wrote from Waiilatpu, October 3, 1842, to the Board to announce his appointment as "Secular Agent and General Superintendent of the Oregon Institute" and his release by the mission. He adds: "Dr. Whitman will be able to give you the particulars respecting the affairs of the mission and the results of the last meeting," etc., etc.³

Mrs. Whitman wrote to her absent husband from Waskopum, March 4, 1843: "I have never felt to regret in the least that you have gone—for I fully believe the hand of the Lord was in it—and that he has yet blessings in store for Oregon. Yes, for these poor degraded Indians." Again, from Waiilatpu, May 18, 1843, "wishing you my dear husband . . . as speedy a return to the bosom of your family as the business of the Lord upon which you have gone will admit of."⁴

In none of these letters nor in any received from the members of the Oregon mission is there even a hint that Dr. Whitman had another purpose in going East than to save and reinforce the mission. Nor do these contemporary letters support in the slightest degree the picturesque narrative of the scene at the dinner at Walla Walla, with the rejoicing over the emigrants from the Red River, for the very good reason that this Hudson's Bay Company emigration arrived the year before!⁵ All this part of the Whitman story is ab-

¹ Letter-book as before. Cf. the "Remarks" in the *Miss. Herald*, Sept. 1843, p. 356.

² Letter-book, "Oregon Indians."

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Letter-book, "Oregon Indians."

⁵ Sir George Simpson, *An Overland Journey Round the World*, Philadelphia, 1847, I. 62 and 94. There were twenty-three families in the party. "Chaque année il vient du Canada un certain nombre de familles qui ne sont point engagées. À la fin de 1841, il en est arrivé trente de la colonie de la Rivière Rouge; près de la moitié s'est établi au Quallamet." Du Floz de Mofras, *Explorations du Territoire de l' Oregon, etc., pendant les Années 1840, 1841 et 1842*, Paris, 1844, II. 209. Cf. Bancroft's *Oregon*, I. 252; also Myron Eells, *History of Indian Missions on the Pacific Coast*, Philadelphia, 1882, p. 166.

The mistake of dating this Red River emigration in 1842 apparently originated with Gustavus Hines in his *Oregon: Its History, Condition and Prospects*, etc., Buffalo, 1851, p. 387. This book was written while Hines was in the East (cf. Bancroft, *Oregon*, I. 225, note) and the mistake was a not unnatural slip of the memory. It had a curious result, however, of supplying the mythical occasion of Whitman's journey.

solutely destitute of contemporary evidence, is irreconcilable with established facts, and is, in fact, purely fictitious.

As most of the rest of it is equally imaginary it may be well at this point to examine into its origin and the trustworthiness of its author before pursuing the detailed criticism of the narrative.

The fictitious account of Whitman's journey, its causes, purpose and achievements, originated with his colleague in the Oregon mission, the Rev. H. H. Spalding.¹ It subsequently received apparent confirmation by the testimony of others connected with the mission, as W. H. Gray, Cushing Eells, and Dr. Whitman's nephew, Perrin B. Whitman. All this testimony is later than Spalding's original statement and gives the clearest internal evidence of having been either derived from him or colored by his narrative. At the time of the Whitman massacre Spalding underwent a terrible nervous and physical strain and apparently never recovered from his sufferings.² He believed the massacre had been instigated by the Catholic missionaries and this belief made him almost if not quite a monomaniac

¹"Mr. Spalding, his first and most zealous associate, attempted to bring these facts before the world, but the caution of those who would whitewash his (Dr. Whitman's) sepulchre induced Mr. Spalding to give up in despair." Gray's *Oregon*, 482. The reader will find reason to question the truthfulness of the concluding words. "Rev. H. H. Spalding was about the first person to make known the fact of Dr. Whitman's going East on a political errand. Dr. G. H. Atkinson learned of it, and believed that this work ought to be set to the credit of missions. He said so publicly. In his journey East in 1865 he told the secretaries of the American Board that while they had been accustomed to look upon their Oregon mission as a failure it was a grand success. They were very skeptical and thought that many extravagant assertions had been made about Whitman's achievement. Dr. Atkinson replied: 'Write to Dr. Eells, as you know him to be careful in his statements and are accustomed to rely on what he says.'" Myron Eells, *Father Eells, or the Results of Fifty-five Years of Missionary Labors in Washington and Oregon: A Biography of Cushing Eells, D.D.*, Boston, 1894, p. 106. Secretary Treat wrote to Dr. Eells and from Dr. Eells's reply which was published in the *Missionary Herald*, Dec., 1866, pp. 370-72, and from the statements Dr. Atkinson had made he prepared an address on "Early Indian Missions," which he delivered at the meeting of the American Board in Pittsfield, Sept. 27, 1866. The report of this address in the *Congregationalist*, Oct. 5, 1866, is the earliest printed version of the Whitman story that I have found. It does not contain the Fort Walla Walla incident. As Mr. Treat was the Secretary of the Board in 1843, and at all times had access to the records I have quoted, one must regret that his desire to believe the Spalding story and to have it believed deterred him from making any serious attempt to verify it. That he was conscious of the inconsistency with the records is evident in his comment on Dr. Eells's letter, *Miss. Herald*, 1866, p. 374.

²"A poor broken-down wreck, caused by the frightful ending of his fellow associates, and of his own missionary labors." Gray's *Oregon*, p. 482. "His nervous system remained a wreck ever afterward." Mrs. F. F. Victor, *River of the West*, Hartford, 1870, p. 409. "There can be no doubt that Spalding's mind was injured by this shock. All his subsequent writings show a want of balance, which inclines me to regard with lenity certain erroneous statements in his publications. I find in the *Oregon Statesman* of August 11, 1855, this line: 'H. H. Spalding, a lunatic upon the subject of Catholicism and not over and above sane upon any subject.'" H. H. Bancroft, *Oregon*, 1, 665, note.

on the subject of Catholicism. His repeated charges brought forth an answer from Brouillet the Vicar-General of Walla Walla,¹ and nine years later Brouillet's pamphlet was included by J. Ross Browne in an official report which he made on the causes of the Indian War in Oregon and Washington.²

Brouillet's reply is temperate in tone but makes assertions about the attitude of the Indians toward the Protestant missionaries and the causes of it, which the missionaries regarded as slanders. But to have this Catholic pamphlet distributed as a public document by the government incensed Spalding beyond endurance and roused him to ceaseless efforts to overwhelm the Catholics with obloquy.³ By lecturing on the Protestant missions, the work of Whitman and the massacre, and by getting various religious bodies and groups of prominent men to pass resolutions drafted by himself he accumulated a mass of material which he got published under the title: *Early Labors of the Missionaries of the American Board, etc., in Oregon, etc.*, as Executive Document 37 (Senate), 41st Congress, 3rd session. It was as an element in this extraordinary campaign of vindication that the legendary story of Whitman was developed.⁴ Nothing could more effectively catch the public ear and prepare the public mind for resentment against the Catholics than to show that Whitman saved Oregon to the United States and then lost his life a sacrifice to the malignant disappointment of the "Jesuits" and the Hudson's Bay Company. This conjecture is very strongly supported by Spalding's allegation in his memorial "American Congress vs. Protestantism in Oregon." "That there is abundant proof to show that the said Whitman massacre and the long and expensive wars that followed were commenced by the above said British

¹ *Protestantism in Oregon: Account of the Murder of Dr. Whitman and the Unjustifiable Calumnies of H. H. Spalding, Protestant Missionary*, by the Rev. J. B. A. Brouillet, N. Y., 1853. Brouillet had saved Spalding's life.

² *Executive Docs. (House of Rep.)*, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., No. 38. Spalding's charges are quoted on pages 49-51.

³ Spalding did not become aware of the republication of Brouillet's pamphlet for some years (*Senate Ex. Doc. 37, 41st Cong., 3rd Sess.*, p. 5).

⁴ The date cannot be fixed with precision. Dr. Atkinson brought the story to Boston in 1865. Secretary Treat wrote Dr. Eells in consequence, Feb. 22, 1866. Bancroft says, I. 657, note: "In 1866-67 Spalding revived the memories of twenty years before, and delivered a course of lectures on the subject of the Wailatpu mission which were published in the *Albany (Or.) States Rights Democrat* extending over a period from November 1866 to February 1867." But the lectures apparently began at least one year earlier, for in one of them printed in the *Early Labors* he says it is eighteen years since the massacre, which occurred in November, 1847. *Exec. Doc. 37*, p. 26.

Extracts from Spalding's lecture and from his memorial entitled "American Congress vs. Protestantism in Oregon" are given in the appendix to this article as "The Primary Source of the Whitman Legend." The date of the publication of *Doc. 37* was 1871.

monopoly for the purpose of breaking up the American settlements and of regaining the territory, and that they were especially chagrined against the said Whitman as being the principal agent in disappointing this scheme."¹

The constant reiteration of the Whitman story in Spalding's collection of materials in *Doc. 37* still further illustrates the reliance that was placed upon it.²

Having shown the circumstances under which the Whitman story was first brought to light it is now time for us to examine into Spalding's veracity or trustworthiness as a source. The earliest testimony we have on this point is Gray's letter to the American Board from Wailatpu, October 14, 1840. "Duplicity is a trait in his character that never in all probability will change."³ The most conclusive proof of Spalding's untrustworthiness if not dishonesty in matters relating to this missionary history can be given. While Dr. Whitman was absent from his mission on his journey east in 1842-1843 his mill was burned by the Indians. Elijah White, the United States sub-Indian-agent, made a special investigation of the circumstances and reported in his letter of April 1, 1843, to Commissioner Crawford at Washington that the chief Feathercat "acknowledged his opinion that the mill was burnt purposely by some disaffected persons towards Dr. Whitman." Extracts from this letter were quoted by Spalding in his *Early Labors*, but following the word "Whitman" he inserted this additional sentence: "The mill, lumber and a great quantity of grain was burned by Catholic Indians, instigated by Romanists, to break up the Protestant mission, and prevent supplies to the on-coming emigration by Dr. Whitman."⁴

This interpolation was made deliberately in an official document for the purpose of manufacturing evidence of previous Catholic malignity which would render plausible Spalding's accusation in regard to the massacre. Again, where Dr. White quotes an old chief as saying in regard to the conference he was holding: "Clark pointed to this day, to you, and this occasion; we have long waited

¹ *Exec. Doc. 37*, p. 42. In the report of Dr. G. H. Atkinson's address before the American Board at Norwich in 1868 it is said: "He told most effectively the story of the manner in which the heroic missionary Dr. Whitman, who was subsequently murdered for the deed, made the journey from Oregon to Washington in 1842," etc. The *Congregationalist*, Oct. 15, 1868. Presumably this address is the same one that Dr. Atkinson later made before the New York Chamber of Commerce, Dec. 3, 1868 (N. Y., John W. Amerman), which contained the legendary interviews with Webster and Tyler, etc.

² Cf. for example, pp. 20-23, 25, 42, 75-76, and 78; cf. *Exec. Doc. 37*. 41st Cong., 3rd Sess.

³ Letter-book, "Oregon Indians."

⁴ Cf. the text of White's letter in *Ten Years in Oregon: Travels and Adventures of Doctor E. White and Lady, etc.*, Ithaca, N. Y., 1850, and in Gray's *Oregon*, p. 229, with *Exec. Doc. 37*, p. 13.

in expectation ; sent three of our sons to Red River School to prepare for it," Spalding changed the last clause to " sent three of our sons to the rising sun to obtain the book from Heaven," thus manufacturing first-hand confirmation of the somewhat doubtful story of the Indians who came to St. Louis for the Bible.¹

Inasmuch as Gray is commonly considered an independent contemporary witness for the Whitman story it is necessary to examine his trustworthiness.² Gray was at Waiilatpu when the missionaries discussed the recall of Spalding and the discontinuance of the Southern mission. Yet in letters in the *Daily* and *Weekly Astorian*, reprinted in circular No. 8³ of the Pioneer and Historical Society of Oregon, he said : " The order to abandon the mission I confess is new to me ; " and in reply to Mrs. F. F. Victor's assertion that Dr. Whitman went East to secure a reversal of the order he denied that a meeting of the mission was held in September 1842⁴ which authorized Whitman's journey. He thus deliberately denies something that he must have known perfectly well if he remembered anything at all about the transaction, and professes ignorance of another fact of which he could not have been ignorant. Gray shared Spalding's intense prejudices and vindictiveness toward the Hudson's Bay Company and the Catholic missionaries. His *History of Oregon* is utterly untrustworthy as a source of Oregon history.⁵

Although many others have testified in recent years to the truth of the Spalding narrative, not a particle of contemporary evidence has ever been advanced in its support ; later testimony has all been colored by the public discussions and men have remembered what Spalding said, not what happened. A convincing example of this fact is furnished by the letter of Cushing Eells of May 28, 1866. He was present at Waiilatpu and was the secretary of the mission meeting, yet he writes in reply to an inquiry

¹ Cf. *Ten Years in Oregon*, p. 185, and Gray's *Oregon*, p. 225, with *Exec. Doc.* 37, p. 13.

² He affirms that his account of the Fort Walla Walla incident is based on " his own knowledge ! " *Hist. of Oregon*, p. 289.

³ Circular 8, pp. 5-6.

⁴ He wrote the Board from Waiilatpu Oct. 3, 1842. " Dr. Whitman will be able to give you all the particulars respecting the affairs of the mission and the results of the last meeting." Letter-book, " Oregon Indians."

⁵ " It would require a book as large as Gray's to correct Gray's mistakes." Bancroft's *History of the Northwest Coast*, II. 536. " It has, however, three faults—lack of arrangement, acrimonious partisanship, and disregard for truth." Bancroft, *History of Oregon*, I. 302. " His book, in my best judgment, is a bitter, prejudiced, sectarian, controversial work in the form of a history." Peter H. Burnett, *Recollections and Opinions of an Old Pioneer*, N. Y., 1880, p. 222. These last two judgments I regard as absolutely just.

It will not escape notice that both Spalding and Gray suppress all reference to the missionary troubles in 1842 and to the action of the Board.

that "the single object of Dr. Whitman, . . . was to make a desperate effort to save the country to the United States."¹ Then follows a paragraph on Whitman's experience in Washington and the Oregon situation, which was derived from Spalding and can not have been Dr. Eells's recollection of Whitman's report, because, as will be shown presently, it cannot have been true. If in Dr. Eells's mind Spalding's inventions had displaced his own recollections, how much weight is to be attached to the testimony of Perrin B. Whitman, Dr. Whitman's nephew, who was only thirteen years of age in 1843?²

The foregoing discussion of the account given by Spalding and Gray of the occasion of Whitman's journey East³ does not aim to disprove that he intended to go to Washington, and to do what he could for the advantage of Oregon. Owing to the infrequency of communication with people from the Pacific coast and the wide public interest in the Oregon territory he could feel assured of being welcomed and of conveying useful information. The only evidences of such intentions that I have found, that are uncontaminated by Spalding's fictions, are a reference in Dr. White's letter of April 1, 1843,⁴ to the Indian Commissioner at Washington, and A. L. Lovejoy's recollections as given in his letter to Dr. Atkinson in 1876. Lovejoy came to Oregon in the emigration of 1842 and was induced to return with Whitman. He writes:

"The day after our arrival Dr. Whitman called at our camp and asked me to accompany him to his house, as he wished me to draw up a memorial to Congress to prohibit the sale of ardent spirits in this country. The Doctor was alive to the interests of this coast, and manifested a very

¹ *Missionary Herald*, 1866, top p. 371.

² P. B. Whitman in a letter "To the Public," Oct. 11, 1880, said that Whitman's journey was for the double purpose of bringing out an immigration and to prevent the trading off of the Northwest coast. *Circular* 8 of the Oregon Pioneer and Historical Society, p. 12. His age is derived from Dr. Whitman's letter to the Board, May 30, 1843. *Letter-book*, "Oregon Indians."

³ That he went East on the business of the mission was a matter of common knowledge at the time. "In 1842 Dr. Whitman visited the United States to obtain further assistance, in order to strengthen the efforts that had already been made. . . . In 1843 Dr. Whitman returned again to Oregon and resumed his labors." *Ten Years in Oregon*, by D. Lee and J. H. Frost, N. Y., 1844. According to Nixon, Mrs. Whitman's diary reveals nothing as to a political object. He explains this silence on the ground that absolute secrecy was necessary. *How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon*, Chicago, 1895, p. 107. Yet according to Gray, Whitman defiantly announced his purpose at the Fort Walla Walla dinner. *Gray's Oregon*, p. 288. Spalding in his contemporary letter to Dr. White the sub-Indian agent mentions Whitman's visit to the States but gives no reason. White's *Ten Years in Oregon*, 202. Gray's *Oregon*, p. 235.

⁴ He writes that the country of the Cayuse Indians "is well-watered, gently undulating, extremely healthy, and admirably adapted to grazing, as Dr. Whitman may have informed you, who resides in their midst." White's *Ten Years in Oregon*, p. 174; also in Gray, p. 219.

warm desire to have it properly represented at Washington; and after numerous conversations with the Doctor touching the future prosperity of Oregon, he asked me one day in a very anxious manner, if I thought it would be possible for him to cross the mountains at that time of the year. I told him I thought he could. He next asked: 'Will you accompany me?' After a little reflexion, I told him I would.¹

Of Whitman's presence in Washington I have been able so far to find not a trace of local contemporary evidence. There is nothing in the *Globe* or the *National Intelligencer* among Washington papers, or in *Niles's Register*, although its pages for 1843 contain many insignificant items of Oregon news, or in the Washington correspondence of the *Tribune* or the *Journal of Commerce*. Curtis's *Webster and Webster's Private Correspondence* are alike silent. Interested as John Quincy Adams was in all diplomatic matters, Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Relations, watchful and suspicious of the administration, his voluminous *Diary* knows nothing of Marcus Whitman. Equally devoid of light are Benton's *Thirty Years' View*, although Benton was a champion of Oregon, and Greenhow's *History of Oregon*, although Greenhow was a translator in the State Department and an indefatigable collector of information about Oregon.² The *Life and Speeches* of Senator Linn, of Missouri, who was the most advanced leader of the Oregon party, make no reference to Whitman. Tyler's *Tyler* lacks any contemporary reference to Whitman's presence in Washington, and if the author had found any he would have given it because he makes some conjectures as to the origin of the notion that Whitman exerted any influence on the diplomacy of that year.³

The only contemporary evidence of Whitman's activity in Washington which has ever been advanced is in a letter which he wrote to the Secretary of War after his return to Oregon. The letter ac-

¹ Nixon, *How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon*, p. 306. Lovejoy's letter occupies pp. 305-312. Lovejoy's letter to Gray of Nov. 6, 1869, is similar in tenor as a whole but does not mention all the facts quoted above. Gray, pp. 324-327.

² Greenhow's preface is dated February 1844. He devotes twenty-five pages to the Oregon Question in 1843 and half a page to the Emigration of that year, p. 391.

³ Tyler's *Letters and Times of the Tylers*, II. 439. In the appendix is a letter from Dr. Silas Reed under date of April 8, 1885, which twice makes mention of Whitman's visit to Washington but says nothing further than that he "furnished valuable data about Oregon and the practicability of a wagon route thereto across the mountains," p. 697. Too much stress cannot be laid on this, as Dr. Reed was an old man and his memory might easily have been colored by Barrows's *Oregon* then recently published. In at least one very important point in this letter he seems to have remembered more than occurred. See p. 699. In the *Atlantic Monthly* for Oct., 1880, in an art. entitled "Reminiscences of Washington" there is what appears to be an independent recollection of Whitman's visit to Washington, but it bears the familiar marks of Spalding's invention. It was written by Ben. Perley Poore. All that needs to be said is that Poore spent the years 1841-1848 in Europe and the East!

companies the draft of a bill to promote safe intercourse with Oregon and begins: "In compliance with the request you did me the honor to make last winter while in Washington I herewith transmit," etc.¹ In addition to this there is Lovejoy's recollection of what Whitman told him during their return. Lovejoy writes:

"The Doctor often expressed himself to me about the remainder of his journey, and the manner in which he was received at Washington and by the Board of Missions at Boston. The Doctor had several interviews with President Tyler, Secretary Webster and many members of Congress, touching the interests of Oregon. He urged the immediate termination of the treaty with Great Britain relative to this country, and the extension of the laws of the United States, and to provide liberal inducements to emigrants to come to this coast."²

All this is probable, but there was nothing novel in it, because the Linn Bill which had passed the Senate the month before had all these objects in view. Lovejoy's recollection shows not a trace of the Spalding legend of Whitman's having arrived in the nick of time to save Oregon from being "traded off for a cod fishery." Every account that has been published of Whitman's interviews with Tyler and Webster except this of Lovejoy is entirely fictitious, and not only fictitious but impossible, and could have originated only with a man ignorant of diplomacy in general and of the Oregon diplomacy in particular.

In the first place, Oregon was in no danger of being lost to the United States. The real danger was that the government would be pushed by the Oregon advocates in the West into an aggressive policy which might result in war with England.³ When the Linn Bill passed the Senate February 3, by a vote of 24 to 22, providing for the extension of the laws of the United States over the whole of the Oregon territory, the erection of courts and the granting of lands to settlers,⁴ there was not the slightest danger of the Senate ratifying a treaty to alienate the territory. The appearance of a solitary missionary in Washington advocating what a majority of the Senate had already voted, and what state legislatures were demanding in resolutions⁵ was veritably a drop in

¹ See Nixon, p. 315.

² Gray's *Oregon*, p. 326. I use the earlier letter this time, the only essential difference between the two being a parenthetical statement that Congress was in session when Whitman arrived, which is a mistake and may be an explanatory afterthought of Lovejoy's.

³ Lord Palmerston said in the House of Commons, March 21, "if that bill passed into a law, an event which he conceived to be impossible, it would amount to a declaration of war." *London Times*, March 22, 1843, p. 3, col. 4.

⁴ The bill and the debates are conveniently summarized by Greenhow, pp. 377-388.

⁵ "There were militant resolutions of the Legislatures of Illinois and of Missouri, relating to the Territory of Oregon." J. Q. Adams's memorandum of a meeting of the

the bucket, and of equal significance. That Whitman influenced American diplomacy in any way at Washington is not only destitute of all evidence but is intrinsically improbable. The belief that he did so originated with Spalding, and the ever-present stamp of his invention in all the varying narratives is the reference to "trading off Oregon for a cod-fishery."¹

The fisheries were not a subject of negotiation in 1842, nor were they proposed for the expected negotiation of 1843.² Consequently

Committee of Foreign Affairs, Feb. 25, 1843. *Diary*, XI. 327. Feb. 9, Representative Reynolds, chairman of a select committee on Oregon, reported a bill for the immediate occupation of the territory. *Niles's Register*, XI.III. 397; Adams's *Diary*, XI. 314.

¹ For the recurrence of this note, see Spalding, *Exec. Doc.* 37, pp. 22, 75; Eells in *Miss. Herald*, 1866, p. 371; Atkinson, *ibid.*, 1869, p. 79; Gray, *Oregon*, p. 316; Victor, *Overland Monthly*, Aug. 1869, p. 155; Poore in *Atlantic Monthly*, Oct. 1880, p. 534; Eells, *History of Indian Missions*, p. 174; Nixon, *How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon*, p. 128-9. Barrows in his *Oregon*, pp. 224-238, shows that the interviews are unhistorical by a process which completely undermines the rest of his narrative. Leaving the question of candor or honesty aside, what can be said of the truthworthiness of a writer who says, p. 233, that there is no evidence that Sir George Simpson was in Washington in 1842-1843 and yet incorporates the myth in his narrative on pp. 153, 158, 202, 203, 204, going so far on p. 203 as to reconstruct a conversation with Webster out of Sir George's *Overland Journey Round the World*? Barrows puts into Webster's mouth a remark about Whitman which was made by an anonymous friend of Webster's to an anonymous writer! Cf. Barrows, p. 225, with *Exec. Doc.* 37, p. 24, or Nixon, p. 133. Spalding does the same thing in his headline. The article is cited by Spalding from the *Independent*, Jan., 1870, but it is not there and has not been found, although a careful search has been made for it. Again, although Barrows lived near Boston, there is no evidence that he ever looked at the *Missionary Herald* for 1842-1843 or the *Reports* of the Board for those years. Barrows's method is unscientific and bewildering to the last degree. He goes over the same ground repeatedly and presents different and inconsistent accounts of the same transactions.

It is but justice to say that Mrs. Victor enjoys the lonely distinction of being the only writer, so far as I know, who, having once published the legend, upon a more careful study of the evidence has had the open-mindedness to see and declare its legendary character. As the avowed author of Bancroft's *Oregon*, working under his editorial supervision, every student of Oregon history is under obligations to her for her scholarly and honest presentation of the facts derived from the unparalleled collection of materials gathered by Mr. Bancroft. While I have been greatly assisted in this study by the bibliographical notes and in a less degree by the text in the Bancroft *History*, every important assertion in this article is my own matured conviction. It is a rare experience in a critical examination of sources to find in any general history so faithful and trustworthy a presentation of the contents of those sources as in the parts of the first volume of Bancroft's *Oregon* that I have subjected to this test. The aspersions cast upon Mrs. Victor and the Bancroft *History* by writers too lazy to find out the facts or too blinded by prejudice to see them or too dishonest to report them may have goaded her into counter-assertions and judgments not so carefully weighed as the text of the *History*, but such criticisms and charges as Nixon brought against the *History* and her work entitle him to rank with Gray in candor and trustworthiness, than which no more can be said. Cf. the *San Francisco Call*, Sept. 1, 1895, and *How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon*, pp. 205-216

² "The only question of magnitude about which I did not negotiate with Lord Ashburton is the question respecting the fisheries." Webster to Mrs. Paige, Aug. 23, 1842, *Private Corresp.*, II. 146. That the fisheries were not to be considered in 1843 is shown by Webster's letter to Minister Everett, Nov. 28, 1842, *ibid.*, 153-4.

Webster could not have told Whitman what Spalding attributes to him. It is in the highest degree improbable that either Tyler or Webster told Whitman anything about their plans, for the President refused to give the Senate that information in December 1842,¹ and it was only with the greatest difficulty that John Quincy Adams wormed it out of Webster on March 25, in the course of a three-hour interview.² Equally fictitious is the story of Sir George Simpson's presence in Washington to negotiate or to influence negotiations in regard to Oregon and the fisheries.³

That Whitman's visit East dispelled ignorance about Oregon or inspired enthusiasm are equally without foundation. No doubt he could contribute some facts of interest, but the widely circulated *Travels of Farnham* were in the field;⁴ Greenhow's exhaustive history was being distributed as a public document; Fremont was under commission to explore the Rockies; the Wilkes Exploring Expedition had explored the Columbia River and Puget Sound Regions two years earlier, and Sub-Indian-Agent White was writing frequent reports to his superiors at Washington. The ignorance and indifference of the government and the public are fictions of a later day.

In such investigation of the newspapers as I have been able to make I have found just one news item about Whitman's journey East, outside of the missionary intelligence of two or three religious papers which refer to his visit to Boston. Whitman called on Horace Greeley in the last part of March and gave him some account of the conditions in Oregon and of his journey. There is not a word in the interview that indicates that he had a political errand

¹ See Pres. Tyler's special message Dec. 23, in reply to the Senate Resolution of Dec. 22, 1842. *Statesman's Year Book*, II. 1315, or *Niles's Register*, LXIII. 286.

² Adams's *Diary*, XI. 344-347. The real Oregon policy of the administration was something very different from Spalding's invention. It was to yield to England the territory north of the Columbia if England would acquiesce in or promote our acquisition of California from San Francisco harbor northward and the annexation of Texas to the United States. English influence was strong in Mexico and it was believed that if England urged these concessions on Mexico she would grant them for a reasonable consideration. See Adams's *Diary*, XI. 340, 347, 351, and 355; Tyler's *Tyler*, II. 692 and 698. That Webster revealed this project to Adams March 25 and about the same time or even later approached General Almonte the Mexican minister on the subject shows that Whitman's interviews, if he had them, had not had the slightest effect. See Adams's *Diary*, XI. 347 and 355, entries of Mar. 25 and April 7. The legendary date of Whitman's arrival in Washington was March 2 or 3. He arrived later than that, but probably not so late as the 25th.

³ I have nowhere found a reference to his presence in Washington outside of the Spalding narrative and its derivatives, nor is there any evidence that he ever had any communications with the Washington authorities on the Oregon question.

⁴ *Travels in the Great Western Prairies, the Anahuac and Rocky Mountains and in the Oregon Territory*, by T. J. Farnham, New York, 1843.

or wished to stir up public sentiment on Oregon.¹ Here was a unique opportunity to reach the public, for Greeley was much interested in Oregon and printed all the news relative to it that he could gather, and had published a cheap edition of Farnham's *Travels* which had an immense sale.²

Turning now to Boston we find in the records of his conferences with the Board the real history of his journey and its purpose. His own statement is summarized in the record as follows :

"Left the Oregon country 3rd. October, 1842, and arrived at Westport, Mo., 15 February³ and in Boston 30 March 1843. Left unexpectedly and brought few letters. Letters of March 1842 had been received and acted on. The difficulties between Mr. Spalding and others were apparently healed, and Mr. S. promises to pursue a different course. The mission wish to make another trial with Mr. Smith and Mr. Gray out of the mission. Mr. Gray requests a dismission and has left the mission and gone to the Methodist settlement. Mr. Rogers also.⁴ . . . There is, however, an influx of Papists and many emigrants from the U. S. are expected. The religious influence needs to be strengthened. The mission therefore propose and request that :

1. One preacher be sent to join them to labor at Waiilatpu—and that
 2. A company of some five or ten men may be found [formed?] of piety and intelligence, not to be appointed by the Board or to be immediately connected with it, who will go to the Oregon country as Christian men, and who, on some terms to be agreed upon, shall take most of the land which the mission have under cultivation with the mills and shops at the several stations, with the most of the stock and utensils, paying the mission in produce from year to year, in seed to the Indians, and assistance rendered to them—or in some similar manner, the particulars to be decided upon in consultation with the men. The result of this would be :

1. Introducing a band of religious men into the country to exert a good religious influence on the Indians and the White population which may come in especially near the mission stations.
2. Counteracting papal efforts and influences.
3. Releasing the missionaries from the great amount of manual labor, which is now necessary for them for their subsistence, and permitting

¹ This interesting description of Whitman's appearance and travels is too long to quote in full. He impressed Greeley as a "noble pioneer, . . . a man fitted to be a chief in rearing a moral Empire among the wild men of the wilderness. . . . He brings information that the settlers in the Willamette are doing well, that the Americans are building a town at the falls of the Willamette." Then follows an item in regard to members of Farnham's party and Whitman's itinerary. "We give the hardy and self-denying pioneer a hearty welcome to his native land." *N. Y. Weekly Tribune*, Mar. 30, 1843. This item was copied into the *Cleveland Herald* of April 6. In the same issue appeared three columns of extracts from the *N. Y. Tribune's* cheap edition of Farnham's *Travels*. Any one can draw correct conclusions as to the relative strength of these two influences.

² *Weekly Tribune*, May 25.

³ If Whitman did not arrive at Westport till Feb. 15, it is clear that he could not have reached Washington Mar. 2 or 3, as is alleged in the legendary account. It was a physical impossibility in 1843. Westport is about 323 miles from St. Louis.

⁴ The omitted passage reports the condition of the Indians and the friendliness of the traders at Fort Walla Walla.

them to devote themselves to appropriate missionary work among the Indians, whose language they now speak.

4. Doing more for the civilisation and social improvement of the Indians than the mission can do unaided.

5. It would afford facilities for religious families to go into the country and make immediately a comfortable settlement, with the enjoyment of Christian privileges,—both those who might be introduced upon the lands now occupied by the mission and others who might be induced to go, and settle in the vicinity of the stations.

6. It would save the mission from the necessity of trading with immigrants. Those now enter the country (*sic*) expect to purchase or beg their supplies from the mission for a year or two, and it would be thought cruel to refuse provide (*sic*) such supplies.¹

Then follow a few facts about Oregon but not a word on the political question or Whitman's trip to Washington. According to Lovejoy's recollection² Whitman felt that the Board disapproved of his action in coming East. Of this there is no record. Yet the self-defensive tone of his later letters reflects the same impression. In such a conjuncture what more effective defense could he have made than to show the urgency of the political crisis in Oregon and in Washington?

Whitman's journey in fact was measurably successful, and the requests of the mission were granted. The minute in regard to his project for an emigration was: "A plan which he proposed for taking with him, on his return to the mission, a small company of intelligent and pious laymen, to settle at or near the mission station, but without expense to the Board or any connection with it, was so far approved that he was authorized to take such men, if those of a suitable character and with whom satisfactory arrangements could be made, can be found."³

Such was Whitman's plan of emigration,⁴ and how different from the legendary proposal to Tyler and Webster to take out a thousand emigrants! The fact that Whitman returned in company with the emigration of 1843 has been transformed by legend into the accomplishment of a previously announced purpose to organize and conduct such a body of emigrants. Whitman, however, did not organ-

¹ Submitted to the Prudential Committee April 4, 1843, Doct. Marcus Whitman, Abenakis and Oregon Indians, Letter-book, 248.

² Gray's *Oregon*, p. 326; Nixon, p. 311.

³ Records of the Prudential Committee. Cf. *Report of the A. B. C. F. M., for 1843*, pp. 169-173; *Missionary Herald*, Sept., 1843, p. 356.

⁴ He seems to have made it public in a measure before leaving Oregon. At any rate Hines refers to "the departure of Dr. Whitman to the United States with the avowed intention of bringing back with him as many as he could enlist for Oregon" as having alarmed the Indians. It was also rumored that the Nez Percés had dispatched one of their chiefs to incite the Indians of the buffalo country to cut off Whitman's party on his return. Hines's *Oregon*, Auburn and Buffalo, 1851, p. 143. Hines's narrative is based on his diary at the time.

ize the emigration of 1843, but joined it and rendered valuable services *en route*. As the facts about the emigration of 1843 are perfectly accessible in Bancroft,¹ I shall merely quote from Whitman's letters such extracts as will illustrate his purposes and his own view of what he had accomplished by coming East.

On May 12, 1843, Whitman writes from St. Louis, "I have made up my mind that it would not be expedient to try and take any families across this year except such as can go at this time. For that reason I have found it my duty to go on with the party myself." Calling attention to the Catholic missionary efforts, for which he refers the committee to De Smedt's *Indian Sketches*, he continues, "I think by a careful consideration of this together with these facts and movements you will realize our feelings that we must look with interest upon this the only spot on the Pacific Coast left where protestants have a present hope of a foothold. It is requisite that some good pious men and ministers go to Oregon without delay as citizens or our hope there is greatly clouded, if not destroyed."

On May 30, he writes again from Shawnee :

"I can not give you much of an account of the emigrants until we get on the road. It is said that there are over two hundred men besides women and children. They look like a fair representation of a country population. . . . We do not ask you to become the patrons of emigration to Oregon, but we desire you to use your influence that in connexion with all the influx into this country there may be a good proportion of good men from our own denomination who shall avail themselves of the advantages of the country in common with others. . . . We cannot feel it at all just that we are doing nothing while worldly men and papists are doing so much. De Smedt's business in Europe can be seen, I think, at the top of the 23d page of his *Indian Sketches*, etc. You will see by his book I think that the papal effort is designed to convey over the country to the English. . . . I think our greatest hope for having Oregon at least part protestant now lies in encouraging a proper attention of good men to go there while the country is open. I want to call your attention to the operation of Farnham of Salem and the Bensons of N. York in Oregon. I am told credibly that secretly government aids them with the Secret service fund.² Capt. Howard of Maine, is also in expectation of being employed by government to take out emigrants should the Oregon bill pass."

¹ Cf. Bancroft, *Oregon*, I. 390 ff. It is perhaps unnecessary to say that Whitman never pretended that he organized the emigration. In his letter to the Secretary of War, received June 22, 1844, he wrote : "The Government will now doubtless for the first time be apprised through you, or by means of this communication, of the immense immigration of families to Oregon which has taken place this year. I have, since our interview, been instrumental in piloting . . . no less than three hundred families," etc. Nixon, p. 316. He would not have expressed himself in this way if his achievement had been the fulfillment of his pledge to Tyler to organize and conduct such a company.

² Cf. Parrish's statement in Bancroft, I. 177.

On November 1 he wrote from the Fort Walla Walla: "my journey across the mountains was very much prolonged by the necessity for me to pilot the emigrants. I tried to leave the party, at different points, and push forward alone, but I found that I could not do so without subjecting the emigrants to considerable risk." Then follows a plea for more help from the mission board:

"We very much need good men to locate themselves two, three or four in a place and secure a good influence for the Indians, and form a nucleus for religious institutions, and keep back Romanism. This country must be occupied by Americans or foreigners: if it is by the latter, they will be mostly papists. . . . I regret very much that I was obliged to return so soon to this country, but nothing was more evidently my duty. . . . Yet I do not regret having visited the States, for I feel that either this country must be American or else foreign and mostly papal. If I never do more than to have been one of the first to take white women across the mountains and prevent the disorder and inaction which would have occurred by the breaking up of the present emigration and establishing the first wagon road across to the border of the Columbia river, I am satisfied. I do not feel that we can look on and see foreign and papal influence making its greatest efforts and we hold ourselves as expatriated and neutral, I am determined to exert myself for my country and to procure such regulations and laws as will best secure both the Indians and white men in their transit and settlement intercourse."

In the following summer, on July 22, Whitman wrote in regard to the emigration of 1843, "The lateness of the spring prevented them from setting out so soon by a month as in ordinary seasons. No one but myself was present to give them the assurance of getting through,¹ which was necessary to keep up their spirits, and to counteract reports which were destined to meet and dishearten them at every stage of the journey.²

From these contemporary letters it is clear that Whitman made no claim to have organized the emigration of 1843 or to have rendered them services, beyond encouragement and advice and guidance. These services were amply recognized by the leaders of the emigration.

In Jesse Applegate's most interesting narrative, "A Day with the Cow Column," and in Peter H. Burnett's *Recollections* there are warm tributes to Whitman's disinterested and untiring efforts for the welfare of the emigration; but neither of these leaders of the movement intimates that the organization of the expedition was owing in any way to Whitman.³ In none of the strictly contemporary sources

¹ In Hastings's *Emigrant Guide to Oregon and California*, etc., Cincinnati, 1845, emigrants are cautioned not to leave Independence later than May 1. I. 147.

² All these letters are in the letter-book, "Oregon Indians." I may hereby express my appreciation of the courtesy with which the officials of the Board gave me access to their records.

³ Applegate's article was originally published in the *Overland Monthly*, Aug. 1868
VOL. VI—20

is Whitman credited with having organized the emigration and in many of them he is not even mentioned.¹

The real force behind the emigration of 1843 was the provisions for granting lands to settlers in Linn's bill which it was expected would pass Congress in 1843.² That a large emigration was in preparation for 1843 Whitman knew in 1842, five months before he left Oregon. May 12, 1842, Gray wrote from Waiilatpu: "There will probably be a large party of immigrants coming to this country in the spring of 1843. Some young men are now returning with the expectation of bringing out a party next Spring."³ That Whitman may have urged individuals to join the emigration is likely enough, and is affirmed by Lovejoy, but he had no time to do more, and they would not have had time to get ready unless they had begun before his arrival. The legendary account of Whitman's relation to the emigration of 1843 has been supported by a letter published by Spalding from John Zachrey, one of the emigrants of 1843, who wrote in 1868 that his father was influenced to go to Oregon by "a publication by Dr. Whitman, or from his representations."⁴ But no copy of this pamphlet has ever been found and it is difficult to find time for Whitman, who reached Westport

I. 127-133. It is reprinted in Nixon's *How Marcus Whitman Saved Oregon*, p. 146-163. Applegate says, "Whitman's great experience and indomitable energy were of priceless value to the emigrating column. . . . To no other individual are the emigrants of 1843 so much indebted for the successful conclusion of their journey as to Marcus Whitman," p. 131-132. Cf. Burnett's *Recollections and Opinions of an Old Pioneer*, N. Y., 1880, "Dr. Whitman, who had performed much hard labor for us and was deserving of our warmest gratitude," p. 126.

¹ The emigration of 1843 attracted much attention in the newspapers, but Whitman's name is nowhere mentioned as a leader with those of the Applegates, Burnett and the others. See Burnett's *Recollections*, pp. 97-98. After Burnett decided to go, he "set to work to organize a wagon company. I visited the surrounding counties wherever I could find a sufficient audience and succeeded even beyond my own expectations." Cf. this extract from a letter from Iowa Territory dated Mar. 4, 1843. "Just now Oregon is the pioneer's land of promise. Hundreds are already prepared to start thither with the spring, while hundreds of others are anxiously awaiting the action of Congress in reference to that country, as the signal of their departure. Some have already been to view the country and have returned with a flattering tale of the inducements it holds out. They have painted it to their neighbors in the highest colors. These have told it to others. The Oregon fever has broken out and is now raging like any other contagion." *N. Y. Weekly Tribune*, April 1, 1843. As this letter is dated Mar. 4, and Whitman arrived at the present site of Kansas City, Feb. 15, and went straight to St. Louis, it is obvious he had no connection with this excitement. Several of the writers realizing this have attributed to Lovejoy the work of getting up the emigration; but he was at Bent's fort in Colorado while Whitman was in the East.

² The proofs of this are numerous. Dr. Whitman himself in a letter to the Secretary of War received June 24, 1844, says of the emigration: "The majority of them are farmers, lured by the prospect of bounty in lands, by the reported fertility of the soil," etc. Nixon, p. 316.

³ Letter-book, "Oregon Indians."

⁴ *Exec. Doc.* 37, p. 26.

February 15, and Boston March 30, and was back again in St. Louis May 12, to write a pamphlet which could be circulated in Texas, where Zachrey lived, early enough for his father to start from Independence, May 22, for Oregon.¹ We have seen how Spalding interpolated Dr. White's letter, and Zachrey's letter contains things that Whitman could not honestly have put in a pamphlet.²

As the years passed Dr. Whitman attached so much importance to his services to the emigration that he evidently came to regard such a service as the purpose of his journey to the East. If it had been among his purposes it was to such a degree incidental and minor that he apparently never mentioned it to the Committee of the American Board, nor did his fellow missionary, Mr. Walker, refer to it.

In 1847, in defending his return East in 1842, Whitman declared that the American interest in Oregon hinged on the success of the immigration of 1843. Had that been disastrous it may be easily seen what would have become of American interests. The disaster last year to those "who left the track I made for them in 1843 . . . demonstrates what I did in making my way to the States in the winter of 1842-3, after the third of October. It was to open a practical route and safe passage and secure a favorable report of the journey from emigrants, which in connection with other objects caused me to leave my family and brave the toils and dangers of the journey." He reiterates this same idea October 18.³

It may be questioned if the emigration of 1843 would have met with disaster if Whitman had not been with them, or, if it had,

¹ Burnett, *Recollections*, p. 99.

² For example "that he himself (that is Whitman) and mission party had taken their families, cattle and wagons through to the Columbia six years before." *Exec. Doc.* 37, p. 26. This was not true. Whitman changed his wagon into a two-wheeled cart at Fort Hall and left the two-wheeled cart at Fort Boisé. Bancroft, I, 133. Farnham saw it there in 1839. *Travels*, p. 77. In *Exec. Doc.* 37, pp. 74-78, is a series of resolutions adopted by the officials of a Baptist Church in Brownsville, Oregon, Oct. 22, 1869, which were evidently drafted by Spalding. In resolution 6, in a report of Whitman's interview with President Tyler, is this sentence: "By his personal representations to President Tyler of this country, of its vast importance, and his assurance of a wagon route, as he assured him we had taken cattle, a wagon, and his missionary families through six years before." Now the "we" may be an inadvertent survival of Spalding's language or a misprint for "he." The interesting thing is that the Zachrey letter supplies the materials for this report of Whitman's conversation with Tyler. As the statement was not true in either case, the most natural conclusion is that Spalding invented it and inserted it in the text of the Zachrey letter. The rest of the Zachrey letter probably represents the coalescence after twenty-three years in Zachrey's memory of what Whitman did on the way for the emigrants with the indistinct recollection of the inducements to start. It is probable that reports of some of Dr. White's speeches to promote emigration in 1842 (cf. White's *Ten Years in Oregon*, pp. 142-143) reached the elder Zachrey, and the boy (he was seventeen years old) later attributed the efforts of White to Whitman.

³ These letters were printed in the *Oregon Native Son*, Feb. 1900, pp. 471-472.

whether that would have really made any difference in the history of the Oregon question. The sufferings of the emigration of 1846 did not prevent the southern road from being attempted again in 1847¹ and with success. The value of Whitman's services in 1843 was very great and need not be questioned. That they were indispensable is far from certain.

That the generally accepted story of Marcus Whitman is entirely unhistorical has been demonstrated. That this fictitious narrative should have been so widely diffused and accepted when the true story of Marcus Whitman was perfectly accessible in the Reports of the American Board and the volumes of the *Missionary Herald* is surprising. That this should have largely taken place since the publication of Bancroft's *History of Oregon* in 1885, which gives a clear and accurate account of what Whitman actually attempted and what he achieved, is almost incredible.

The results of this investigation will come to many as a shock. Extraordinary efforts have been made in good faith to disseminate the story of Marcus Whitman in order to raise money for a suitable memorial and especially for Whitman College, and to many interested in these enterprises this criticism of the Whitman legend will doubtless seem most unfortunate. Yet it is the true Marcus Whitman whom they wish to honor, the devoted and heroic missionary who braved every hardship and imperilled his life for the cause of Christian missions and Christian civilization in the far Northwest and finally died at his post, a sacrifice to the cause, and not a political *deus ex machina*, a figment of H. H. Spalding's invention. The sturdy manliness and Christian devotion of Marcus Whitman, the unceasing labors of his life and his death in the service of Christian missions in Oregon, fully deserve every honorable memorial. The perversion of history cannot honor such a man.

EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE.

APPENDIX

THE PRIMARY SOURCE OF THE WHITMAN LEGEND

I.

Extracts from the Lecture of H. H. Spalding, as given in Senate Exec. Doc. 37, 41st Congress, third session, pp. 18-22.

IN 1841 no missionaries crossed, but several emigrant families, bringing wagons, which, on reaching Fort Hall, suffered the same fate with those of 1840. In 1842 considerable emigration moved forward with ox teams and wagons, but on reaching Fort Hall the same story was told them,

¹ See Bancroft, I. 543-572.

and the teams were sacrificed, and the emigrant families reached Dr. Whitman's station late in the fall, in very destitute circumstances. About this time, as events proved, that shrewd English diplomatist, Governor Simpson, long a resident on the Northwest coast, reached Washington, [p. 19] after having arranged that an English colony of some 150 souls should leave the Selkirk Settlement on the Red River of the lakes in the Spring of 1842, and cross the Rocky Mountains by the Saskatchewan Pass.

DR. WHITMAN'S WINTER JOURNEY, 1843.

The peculiar event that aroused Dr. Whitman and sent him through the mountains of New Mexico, during that terrible winter of 1843, to Washington, just in time to save this now so valuable country from being traded off by Webster to the shrewd Englishman for a "cod fishery" down east, was as follows: In October of 1842 our mission was called together, on business, at Wailatpu—Dr. Whitman's station—and while in session, Dr. W. was called to Fort Walla-Walla to visit a sick man. While there the "brigade" for New Caledonia, fifteen bateaux, arrived at that point on their way up the Columbia, with Indian goods for the New Caledonia or Frazer River country. They were accompanied by some twenty chief factors, traders, and clerks of the Hudson's Bay Company, and Bishop Demois, who had crossed the mountains from Canada, in 1839—the first Catholic priest on this coast; Bishop Blanchett came at the same time.

While this great company were at dinner, an express arrived from Fort Colville, announcing the (to them) glad news that the colony from Red River had passed the Rocky Mountains and were near Colville. An exclamation of joy burst from the whole table, at first unaccountable to Doctor Whitman, till a young priest, perhaps not so discreet as the older, and not thinking that there was an American at the table, sprang o his feet, and swinging his hand, exclaimed: "Hurrah for Columbia! (Oregon.) America is too late; we have got the country." In an instant, as by instinct, Dr. Whitman saw through the whole plan, clear to Washington, Fort Hall, and all. He immediately rose from the table and asked to be excused, sprang upon his horse, and in a very short time stood with his noble "Cayuse," white with foam, before his door; and without stopping to dismount, he replied to our anxious inquiries with great decision and earnestness: "I am going to cross the Rocky Mountains and reach Washington this Winter, God carrying me through, and bring out an emigration over the mountains next season, or this country is lost." The events soon developed that if that whole-souled American missionary was not the "son of a prophet," he guessed right when he said a "deep-laid scheme was about culminating which would deprive the United States of this Oregon, and it must be broken at once, or the country is lost." We united our remonstrances with those of sister Whitman, who was in deep agony at the idea of her husband perishing in the snows of the Rocky Mountains. We told him it would be a

miracle if he escaped death either from starving or freezing, or the savages, or the perishing of his horses, during the five months that would be required to make the only possible circuitous route, via Fort Hall, Taos, Santa Fé, and Bent Fort. His reply was that of my angel wife six years before: "I am ready, not to be bound only, but to die at Jerusalem or in the snows of the Rocky Mountains for the [p. 20] name of the Lord Jesus or my country. I am a missionary, it is true, but my country needs me now." And taking leave of his missionary associates, his comfortable home, and his weeping companion, with little hope of seeing them again in this world, he entered upon his fearful journey the 2d of October 1842, and reached the City of Washington the 2d of March 1843, with his face, nose, ears, hands, feet, and legs badly frozen. It is well that the good man did not live to see himself and his faithful associates robbed and their character slandered by that very Government he was ready to lay down his life for. It would have been to him, as it is to me, the most mournful event of my life. . . .

DR. WHITMAN'S SUCCESSFUL MISSION AT WASHINGTON.

On reaching the settlements, Dr. Whitman found that many of the now old Oregonians—Waldo, Applegate, Hamtree, Keyser, and others—who had once made calculations to come to Oregon, had abandoned the idea because of the representations from Washington that every attempt to take wagons and ox teams through the Rocky Mountains and Blue Mountains to the Columbia had failed. Dr. Whitman saw at once what the stopping of wagons at Fort Hall every year meant. The representations purported to come from Secretary Webster but really from Governor Simpson, who, magnifying the statements of his chief trader, Grant, at Fort Hall, declared the Americans must be going mad, from their repeated fruitless attempts to take wagons and teams through the impassable regions of the Columbia, and that the women and children of those wild fanatics had been saved from a terrible death only by the repeated and philanthropic labors of Mr. Grant, at Fort Hall, in furnishing them with horses. The doctor told these men as he met them that his only object in crossing the mountains in the dead of the winter, at the risk of his life, and through untold sufferings, was to take back an American emigration that summer through the mountains to the Columbia with their wagons and teams. The route was practicable. We had taken our cattle and our families through several years before. They had nothing to fear; but to be ready on his return. The stopping of wagons at Fort Hall was a Hudson Bay Company scheme to prevent the settling of the country by Americans, till they could settle it [p. 21] with their own subjects from the Selkirk settlement. This news spread like fire through Missouri, as will be seen from Zacrey's statement. The doctor pushed on to Washington and immediately sought an interview with Secretary Webster—both being from the same State—and stated to him the object of his crossing the mountains, and laid before him the great importance of

Oregon to the United States. But Mr. Webster lay too near Cape Cod to see things in the same light with his fellow-statesman who had transferred his worldly interests to the Pacific coast. He awarded sincerity to the missionary, but could not admit for a moment that the short residence of six years could give the Doctor the knowledge of the country possessed by Governor Simpson, who had almost grown up in the country, and had traveled every part of it, and represents it as an unbroken waste of sand deserts and impassable mountains, fit only for the beaver, the gray bear and the savage. Besides, he had about traded it off with Governor Simpson, to go into the Ashburton treaty, for a cod-fishery on Newfoundland.

The doctor next sought, through Senator Linn, an interview with President Tyler, who at once appreciated his solicitude and his timely representations of Oregon, and especially his disinterested though hazardous undertaking to cross the Rocky Mountains in the winter to take back a caravan of wagons. He said that, although the doctor's representations of the character of the country, and the possibility of reaching it by wagon route, were in direct contradiction of those of Governor Simpson, his frozen limbs were sufficient proof of his sincerity, and his missionary character was sufficient guarantee for his honesty, and he would, therefore, as President, rest upon these and act accordingly ; would detail Frémont with a military force to escort the doctor's caravan through the mountains ; and no more action should be had toward trading off Oregon till he could hear the result of the expedition. If the doctor could establish a wagon route through the mountains to the Columbia River, pronounced impossible by Governor Simpson and Ashburton, he would use his influence to hold on to Oregon. The great desire of the doctor's American soul, Christian withal, that is, the pledge of the President that the swapping of Oregon with England for a cod-fishery should stop for the present, was attained, although at the risk of his life, and through great sufferings, and unsolicited, and without the promise or expectation of a dollar's reward from any source. And now God giving him life and strength, he would do the rest, that is, connect the Missouri and Columbia rivers with a wagon track so deep and plain that neither national envy nor sectional fanaticism would ever blot it out. And when the 4th of September, 1843, saw the rear of the doctor's caravan of nearly two hundred wagons with which he started from Missouri last of April emerge from the western shades of the Blue Mountains upon the plains of the Columbia, the greatest work was finished ever accomplished by one man for Oregon on this coast. And through that great emigration, during the whole summer, the doctor was their everywhere-present angel of mercy, ministering to the sick, helping the weary, encouraging the wavering, cheering the mothers, mending wagons, setting broken bones, hunting stray oxen ; climbing precipices, now in the rear, now in the center, now at the front ; in the rivers looking out fords through the quicksands, in the deserts looking out for water ; in the dark mountains looking out passes ; at noontide or midnight, as though those

thousands were his own children, and those wagons and those flocks were his own property. Although he asked not and expected not a dollar as a reward from any source, he felt himself abundantly rewarded when he saw the desire of his heart accomplished, the great wagon route over the mountains established, and Oregon in a fair way to be occupied with American settlements and American commerce. And especially he felt himself doubly paid, when, at the end of his successful expedition, and standing alive at home again on the banks of the Walla-Walla, these thousands of his fellow summer pilgrims, wayworn and sunbrowned, took him by the hand and thanked him with tears for what he had done.

II.

Extract from the Memorial of H. H. Spalding to Congress entitled: American Congress vs. Protestantism in Oregon, Exec. Doc. 37, 41st Cong., third sess., p. 42.

And that said Whitman, by his sleepless vigilance became convinced that a deep-laid plan was about culminating to secure this rich country of Oregon Territory to Great Britain, from misrepresentation on the part of Great Britain and for want of information as to the character and value of the country on the part of the Government of the United States.

And that to prevent the sale and transfer of said Territory, and the consequent loss to the United States of this great Northwest and its valuable sea board, and the great commercial considerations therewith, said Whitman did, in the dead of winter, at his own expense, and without asking or expecting a dollar from any source, cross the continent, amid the snows of the Rocky Mountains and the bleakness of the intervening plains, inhabited by hostile savages, suffering severe hardships and perils from being compelled to swim broad, rapid, and ice-floating rivers, and to wander lost in the terrific snow-storms, subsisting on mule and dog meat, and reached the City of Washington not an hour too soon, confronting the British agents Ashburton, Fox, and Simpson, who, there is evidence to show, in a short time would have consummated their plans, and secured a part, if not all, of our territory west of the mountains to Great Britain, and by his own personal knowledge disproving their allegations, and by communicating to President Tyler important information concerning the country, and the fact that he had taken his wagons and mission families through years before, and that he proposed taking back a wagon-train of emigrants that season, did thereby prevent the sale and loss of this our rich Pacific domain to the people of the United States.

And that said Whitman did then return to Oregon Territory and conduct the first wagon-train of 1,000 souls to the Columbia River, thereby greatly increasing American influence, and completely breaking the influence of the British monopoly and adding immensely to the courage and wealth of the little American settlement.

DOCUMENTS

1. *Diary of Samuel Cooper, 1775-1776.*¹

SAMUEL COOPER, the writer of this diary, was one of the distinguished men of the American Revolution. Born in Boston, March 28, 1725, he was the second son and third child of the Rev. William Cooper,² by his wife Judith, daughter of Samuel Sewall, Chief Justice of the province. His grandmother, Mehetabel Cooper, "the woman," as Dr. Colman said on her death, "that one would have wished to be born of," was niece and coheiress to Lieutenant-Governor Stoughton, her mother being a daughter of Israel Stoughton, lieutenant-colonel of Rainborow's regiment, in the Parliamentary army. After completing his preparatory studies at the Public Latin School, he entered Harvard College, and was graduated thence in 1743, in the same class with James Otis. The year following he was called to the ministry, being chosen, despite his youth, to succeed his father, recently deceased, as associate pastor of the church in Brattle Street (by the Mathers stigmatized as the "Manifesto" Church), of which his grandfather, Thomas Cooper,² was a founder. On May 21, 1746, he was ordained, and at the death of his colleague, Dr. Colman, the next year, became pastor, and continued as such until his own death, December 29, 1783. He was a fellow of Harvard College from 1767 to 1783, and on the resignation of Dr. Locke was elected to the presidency, but declined the office, as his father had done thirty-seven years before on the death of President Wadsworth. From 1758 to 1770, and again from 1777 to 1783, he was chaplain to the General Court. One of the founders of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1780, he was its vice-president from that year until his death. In 1750 he received from Yale College the honorary degree of M.A., and in 1767 that of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh.

He was one of those to whom the confidential letters of Governor Hutchinson were shown; though from his own testimony, it

¹The original diary is in the possession of Marvin M. Taylor, Esq., of Worcester, by whom it was kindly lent to me. His wife, the late Mrs. H. Emilie Taylor, was a lineal descendant of the writer.

²Some account of Dr. Cooper's family may be found in the *N. E. Hist. Geneal. Reg.*, XLIV. 53; XLIX. 385.

appears that they were not transmitted to him, as has repeatedly been affirmed. During the Revolution he was a frequent and powerful writer on the patriotic side; but, apart from sermons, letters, and a few political essays, there are no writings preserved, which can now be distinguished as his. "The characters the most conspicuous," writes John Adams¹ in 1818, "the most ardent and influential in the revival of American principles and feelings from 1760 to 1766 were, first and foremost, before all and above all, James Otis; next to him was Oxenbridge Thacher; next to him, Samuel Adams; next to him, John Hancock; then Dr. Mayhew; then Dr. Cooper and his brother."

"Dr. Cooper was a fine scholar. . . . He wrote with elegance, and his delivery was eloquent. He had a readiness of thought and flow of language, that gave him great command over his hearers, whether in the pulpit or in conversation. His manners were polished and courteous, and in the peculiar functions of his office he had great power to impress and to soothe. These qualifications secured to him the private affection and admiration of his parishioners; while his knowledge of the world, and the active part which he took in public affairs procured him the esteem and confidence of many eminent public characters."² "To his uncommon endowments," says Palfrey, "he joined an address and what is called a *talent for affairs*, which, if he had not been the leading divine, would perhaps have distinguished him as the most accomplished gentleman and adroit statesman of his country and time."

He married, September 11, 1746, Judith, only daughter of Dr. Thomas Bulfinch, a prominent physician of Boston. By her he had two daughters, one of whom married Gabriel Johonnot (often mentioned in the pages of the diary), and the other Joseph Sayer Hixon, of Montserrat.

There are several portraits of Dr. Cooper, some of which are by Copley. Beside those in the possession of his descendants, there are two belonging to the Massachusetts Historical Society. Another painting, evidently a Copley, was owned by the late Oliver Wendell Holmes. Yet another likeness hangs in Memorial Hall at Cambridge.

Dr. Cooper, as we learn from the diary and elsewhere,³ left

¹ *Works*, X. 284.

² Tudor, *Life of James Otis*, p. 151.

³ It appears that there were earlier leaves of this diary, now missing, from the following passage in the *History of Brattle Street Church*, by Lothrop, p. 102: "'On the 16th of April, 1775,' writes Dr. Cooper, in a journal, some fragments of which have been preserved and which I have been permitted to see [but which the present writer has failed to trace], 'the troubles in Boston increasing, and having received several menaces and

Boston shortly before the beginning of the siege, and did not return till after the evacuation. During this time he resided first at Weston, in the family of Samuel P. Savage, Esq., and afterwards at Waltham, where he supplied the pulpit, occasionally preaching in other towns and villages of Middlesex.

FREDERICK TUCKERMAN.

DIARY

19. [April 1775] Wednesday. wak'd by M^r Savage¹ about 3 o Clock; a large Detachment f'm General Gage's army was at Lexington marching for Concord—rose, and set off with Mrs Cooper, call'd upon B^r² and Sister Cooper at Park's, went to M^r Woodward's³: the Country round alarm'd—set out with th^m for Framingham. din'd at Buckminsters. went to M^r Stones at Sthboro. slept there and our Horses kept.

20. Thursday. Continu'd at M^r Stones' slept there Horses kept.

21. Return'd to Weston with B^r and Sister din'd at M^r Woodward's. After Dinner M^r Cooper went with Master Hubbard towards Boston. I return'd to M^r Savage's slept there with M^r Conchlyn⁴ of Leicester M^r Cooper slept at Mr Cushing's.⁵ Horse kept there.

22. Saturday. I din'd with B^r and Sister Cooper at Parks my wife at M^r Savage's slept there. Horse kept.

insults, particularly at Mrs. Davis's from an officer, I left Boston by the advice of friends, and came with my wife to Mr. Savage's, at Weston, designing to ride in the country for the recruiting of my health, and to return to Boston in a few weeks, where I had left my dear child, all my plate, books, furniture, and so forth.¹ "He was at Lexington," continues the authority just cited, "and dined with the Rev. Mr. Clarke, the minister, in company with Mrs. Hancock, the day before the battle." Cf. *Queries of George Chalmers*, in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, fourth series, IV. 371, 372.

¹ Samuel Phillips Savage (1718-1797) was moderator of the meeting at the Old South Church, which decided that the tea should not be landed. He was a delegate to the first Provincial Congress, president of the Massachusetts Board of War during the Revolution, and judge of the Court of Common Pleas for Middlesex. "He owned and occupied at this time the house standing on the Deacon Bigelow farm, so called, in the north part of Weston, near Daggett's corner." Drake, *History of Middlesex*, II. 496.

² William Cooper, an ardent and fearless patriot, whose name is found attached to nearly all the Boston papers of the Revolution. Born in Brookline, October 1, 1721, he was educated at the Boston Public Latin School, and in early life became a merchant. After filling various offices, he was chosen in 1761 town clerk, in his brother's meeting-house, and re-elected annually for forty-nine years. During the war he was a member and clerk of the Committee of Correspondence, and in 1775 secretary of the Committee of Safety. He was several times a member of the House, and its speaker *pro tem.* during two sessions. From 1759 to 1799 he was register of probate for Suffolk. Very active in the affairs of the town and province, he served on many important committees, drafted many of the town documents of the Revolutionary period, and was a frequent writer in the public prints. He married, April 25, 1745, Katharine, daughter of Colonel Jacob Wendell, a merchant and member of the Council, and had issue eight sons and seven daughters. He died in Boston, November 28, 1809, aged 88.

³ The Rev. Samuel Woodward (H.C. 1748), minister of Weston.

⁴ The Rev. Benjamin Conklin (Coll. N.J. 1755), minister of Leicester.

⁵ The Rev. Jacob Cushing, D.D. (H.C. 1748), minister of Waltham.

23. *Lord's day.* Confin'd at M^r Savages by Weather and Indisposition. Horse kept.

24. *Monday.* Went with B^r Cooper to Watertown. din'd at Brewers, saw Dispatch¹ f'm Hartford. slept at M^r Savages. Horse kept there.

25. Went with M^m Cooper towards Boston to be near at Hand in Case the Inhabitants s'd have Leave f'm Gen^r Gage to quit the Town wch had been shut up since last Thursday: found no Communication between Boston and the Country. din'd at M^r John Dennies² at little Cambridg.³ return'd to M^r Savages, saw in the Way vast Number of our Militia marching in from the western Parts, slept at M^r Savages. Horse kept for first Night at Deacon Russell's.

Wednesday 26. Went in my Chaise to Cambridg, din'd at D^r Appleton's⁴ M^r Hill and M^r How came to see me there, bro't me a Letter f'm Gov^r Pownall and another f'm D^r Franklin. Went to the Committee of Safety, communicated D. [r] F.^rs Letter, saw General Ward⁵ paid transient Comps to Him and Committee. heard on my return that D^r Bond⁶ of Marblehead was apprehended for giving false Intelligence to Salem and Marblehead &c Forces by wch they were delay'd coming up to the Fight⁷ on Wednesday. Slept at M^r Savages. Horse at Deacon Russell's. Boston still shut up. my dear Nabby⁸ there, no communication. Reports that the Inhabitants were promis'd Liberty to leave the Town with their Effects upon giving up their Arms, that many had done so, but all still shut up. Reports also that the Forces from the Country wanting to be led immediately on to action began to grow uneasy.

Thursday 27. Went with M^m Cooper in my chaise to Cambridg, both din'd at President Langdon's,⁹ return'd to M^r Savages p.m. slept there. Horse at D. Russell's.

Friday 28. At M^r Savages, din'd there. Went with M^m Cooper to visit Sister C. at Park's. I visited Neighbors Fisk. Fuller. Osmore. Ephraim Parks. slept at M^r Savages. Horse at Russells

Sat. 29. Saturday. My Wife went to Cambridg with B^r Cooper in my Chaise. She took a Boy there and proceeded to Roxbury: to try

¹ See *Journ. Prov. Cong. Mass.*, p. 151, and note.

² John Dennie, a prominent merchant and loyalist.

³ The southerly part of Cambridge, afterwards incorporated as the town of Brighton.

⁴ The Rev. Nathaniel Appleton, D.D. (H.C. 1712), for more than sixty-six years minister of Cambridge, and for nearly as long a fellow of the Corporation. He was the second person honored by the college with the degree of D.D., Increase Mather having been the first.

⁵ Artemas Ward, whose name stands first on the list of major-generals appointed by the Continental Congress, June 17. 1775. He had already been appointed by the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts commander of all the forces raised by that colony.

⁶ Nathaniel Bond (H.C. 1766), surgeon of the 14th Continental regiment, who was charged before the Committee of Safety "with having acted an unfriendly part to this colony."¹⁰ The charges were not sustained. See *Journ. Prov. Cong. Mass.*, p. 555.

⁷ At Lexington and Concord.

⁸ His daughter, Abigail.

⁹ The Rev. Samuel Langdon, D.D., sometime minister of Portsmouth, N. H., and from 1774 to 1780 president of Harvard College.

if She c'd bring Nabby f'm Boston. She went to the Guards on the Neck. Cap't Shee of the Regulars obligingly offerr'd to carry a Billet to Nabby, told her he saw her well the day before. Nabby received the Billet that Evg. desiring her to be at Roxbury next Day if she could get out of Boston. I went to Cambridg a.m. din'd with M^m Hill Quincy &c at Professor Wigglesworth's,¹ return'd by Sunset. M^m Cooper return'd after 9 o Clock. Horse at Mr. Savages: being too late to send it to Russell's.

30. *Lord's day.* M^m Cooper went to Roxbury for Nabby. I pch'd for M^r Woodward a. m. he pray'd. Din'd with him, as did Mr. Savage. I pray'd p. m. He pch'd. M^r Woodward pray'd for my Daughter's Deliverance, return'd to Mr. Savages at 6 o Clock. M^m Cooper just arriv'd there with Nabby. Horse at D. Russell's Nabby and Katy slept with us at Mr. Savages

1. *May. Monday.* Mrs. Cooper went wth Sister Cooper to Charlestown, they din'd at M^r Carys. sent Billets by Hopkins the Ferriman for our Trunks. met M^r Payne of Boston, a Message f'm him to me. return'd in Evening. I went with M^r Savage a. m. to Capt Whittemore's, and Mr Woodward's, din'd at Mr Savages. went with him p. m. to M^r Cushing's. Waltham. Katy and Nabby, my Wife and I, slept at Mr Savages: Horse at D. Russells

2. *May. Tuesday.* Sat out in the Morning with M^m Cooper for charlestown. din'd at M^r Carys, receiv'd our Trunks f'm Boston with Brothers children, went to Medford. Drank Coffee with Deacon Smith's Lady at M^r Bishop's. slept at M^r Turell's.² Horse kept there. Nabby and Katy at M^r Savage's.

3. *Wednesday.* visited M^m Smith and M^r Payne and Family at Brook's. went about 11 o Clock to Cambridg by Menotomy.³ saw the Houses and Barns that had suffer'd in the Battle. Lt. Hull, a British officer died of his Wounds just as we pass'd the House where he lay. Mrs. Cooper din'd at Mr. Wigglesworth's. I din'd at Hastings with committee of Safety. News confirm'd that N. York had Secur'd all King's Troops and Stores, &c drank Coffee at John Harrington's. He kindly gave us a Bottle of Metheglin.⁴ Slept at M^r Savage's. Horse at D. Russell's. Nabby and Katy at M^r Savage's.

4. *Thursday.* My Wife and Nabby went to Cambridg and Charlestown in my chaise. I visited Sister Cooper at Park's. call'd at Dan Parks'. went f'm thence on Foot to M^r Inches at D^r Russell's House. din'd there. call'd at Sister Cooper's after dinner Katy at Mr Savages all day. Slept at Mr Savage's. Katy and Nabby at Joseph Russells Horse kept at D. Russell's.

¹ The Rev. Edward Wigglesworth, D.D. (H. C. 1749), Hollis Professor of Divinity.

² The Rev. Ebenezer Turell (H. C. 1721), second minister of Medford. His life of Benjamin Colman is pronounced by Quincy, "the best biography extant of any native of Massachusetts written during its provincial state." *Hist. Harv. Univ.*, II. 78.

³ The Second Parish in Cambridge; later West Cambridge, now Arlington.

⁴ Mead, a strong liquor made of honey and water fermented and flavored.

Friday, May 5. Carried Nabby in my chaise 10^o Clock a. m. to M^r Woodward's. He not being at home rode with her towards Framingham. oated at Reeve's Tavern gratis. return'd to Mr Woodward's. we din'd there. Katy and Mrs Cooper at Savages. return'd by Parks'. found Mrs Cooper there. Katy walk'd over to Mr Woodwards slept with Nabby there. My wife and I at M^r Savages. A Travailer f'm Hartford inform'd me this Day, that Connecticut had voted an Army of 6,000. Worcester¹ 1st Officer, Spencer next. Putnam 3^d. heard also a Report that the N. Yorkers had taken a King's Vessel² with a large Sum of Money after a bloody Engagement. D^r Prescott³ of Groton visited me this Morning and propos'd my Supplying their Pulpit, propos'd to Mr Woodward his going there and that I w'd supply his Pulpit wch He c'd not comply with. Horse at D. Russells.

Saturday, 6th M^r and M^a Hyde call'd upon us early this Morng. He and my Wife sat out in my chaise about 10. for charlestown to try if we could bring Part of our Furniture from Boston. I din'd at M^r Savage's. M^a Cooper at Charlestown. She return'd in the Evening. we slept at Mr Savages. Horse at Russell's

Lord's day 7. May. Went to publick Worship at Weston. heard Mr. Cushing both Parts of the Day. we din'd at Mr. Woodward's. my Horse at Josiah Smith's gratis. saw Mrs Jackson of Boston and her Son there p. m. going to N. Haven. Slep't at Mr Savages. Horse at Russell's.

Monday 8th. Cloudy and small Rain. We Din'd at M^r Savages. I bro't Nabby and Katy p.m. from M^r Woodwards to M^r Joseph Russell's agreed for them both at 1 Doll. p'r Week. slept at M^r Savage's. Horse at Russell's.

Tuesday, 9. Went with M^a Cooper in my chaise to Brooklyne. Maj^r Thompson's Wife brot her a boy to carry her to the Lines, where She saw her Brother,⁴ found he was unable to procure our Furniture f'm Boston; I walk'd to Mrs. Hyslop's. din'd there with D^r Chauncy⁵ and Lady: Col. Quincy, Deacon Jeffries and Lady. saw Mr. Hunt, Mr Hill and M^r Quincy. Rumor that the Troops were likely to make a Sally f'm Boston. return'd to Mr. Savages, stop'd by the Way at M^a William's Waltham, saw Mrs Gill who had with great Difficulty got out of Boston. slept at Mr. Savage's. Horse at Russell's.

Wednesday. Went in my chaise and Mr S^r Horse to the Lines at Roxbury. I stopt at the George Tavern on Boston Neck. Mrs Cooper

¹ David Wooster, commander of the Connecticut forces; afterwards appointed by the Continental Congress a brigadier-general.

² "Two sloops which lay at the wharves laden with flour and supplies for the British at Boston, of the value of eighty thousand pounds, were speedily unloaded." Bancroft, *History*, edit. 2, VII. 328.

³ Oliver Prescott (H. C. 1750), a noted physician, and brother of Colonel William Prescott. From 1777 to 1779 he sat in the Council of Massachusetts.

⁴ Dr. Thomas Bulfinch (H. C. 1746), of Boston, an eminent physician and the father of Charles Bulfinch, the architect.

⁵ The Rev. Charles Chauncy, D.D. (H. C. 1721), from 1727 to 1787 minister of the First Church in Boston.

met Dr Bulfinch on the Lines. we din'd at Mr Pierpoints¹ Roxbury. drank Coffee at Mr Hall's Watertown. slept at Mr Savages. Horse at Russell's.

Thursday 11th Fast day. I went to Lincoln Meeting. saw Mr Green, Call and Families at Mr. Adam's. Mr. Lawrence pray'd and pch'd a. m. prepare to meet thy God o Israel. spent Interval at Mr Lawrence's. I pray'd p.m. Mr. L. pch'd. supp'd with him. Mrs. Cooper not abroad. Slept' at M^r S. Horse at Russell's.

Friday 12. Went with M^m Cooper in my Chaise to little Cambridg. Din'd with Mr Dennie. He gave me a Variety of Seed; I gave some to Mr Savage and the rest to J. Russell. went p. m. to old Cambridg. stop't at Congress at Watertown: found them engag'd on the Point of a new Governm't.² drank Tea at Waltham with M^m Gill at her Lodgings. Mr. Edward Green and Lady there. Slept at Savages. Horse Russell's.

Saturday. 13. May. Went to Concord with Mr Savage. call'd at Mr Hubbard's: f'm thence to Mr. Emerson's.³ He was abroad, engag'd to pch for him on the Morrow, while he was to supply Groton. return'd to M^r Savages, we din'd there. we went with M^m Savage Sister Cooper to Nabby's chamber drank Coffee. Slept at Savages; Horse at Russell's.

Lord's day. 14. Went to Concord with Nabby. put my Horse at M^r Hubbard's. found to my Surprize M^r. Emerson at the Meeting House Door. He pray'd I pch'd a. m. f'm, the Consolation of Israel. We din'd at Mr Emerson's. with Mr. Knox and Wife of Boston. I pray'd Mr Emerson pch'd p. m. we drank Coffee at M^r Hubbards. slept at Mr. Savages. Horse at Russell's.

Monday 15th My Wife and Daughter went to Medford in my Chaise. din'd at M^r Turell's. drank Tea at Mrs. Hunts Watertown. I din'd at Mr. S. drank Coffee at Sister Cooper's. My Wife and Nabby return'd in th^e Evg. sleep't at Mr. S. Horse at Russell's.

Tuesday May 16. Went with M^r Savage, his Horse and chaise to see Mrs Greenleaf at Waltham, din'd with Gen^r Ward call'd at Mr Hall's Watertown, saw Mr Cook and Mr John Greenleaf. slept at Mr. S. Horse at R.

Wednesday. 17. Went with M^m Cooper in my Chaise to see Mad^m Foyes⁴ Family and M^r Bowdoin.⁵ call'd at Deacon Tudors at little Cambridg. treated wth a Glass of Wine and Gingerbread. din'd with

¹ Robert Pierpont, a merchant, and member of the Boston Committee of Correspondence.

² "Whether there is now existing in this colony a necessity of taking up, and exercising the powers of civil government," *Jour. Prov. Cong. Mass.*, p. 219.

³ The Rev. William Emerson (H. C. 1761), minister of Concord, and chaplain at Ticonderoga, where he died in 1776. He was the grandfather of Ralph Waldo Emerson.

⁴ Elizabeth Foye, daughter of John Campbell, proprietor of the Boston *News Letter*. She married William Foye, a member of the Council and for many years treasurer of the Province, and had Mary, who married the Rev. William Cooper (his second wife), and had Mary, who married Dr. Samuel Gardner (H. C. 1746), of Milton, and left issue.

⁵ James Bowdoin, LL.D., F.R.S., afterwards governor of Massachusetts.

his Son in Law¹ and Daughter Savage at M^{rs} Thompson's, at little Cambridg. Major Thompson at Connecticut on publick Service. Went to the Lines, but c'd not find D^r Bulfinch as we hop'd. visited M^r Bowdoin at M^{rs} Bowman's of Dorchester. found him extremely low with a Lung Fever. He had met with gt Difficulty in getting out of Boston. The Admiral [Graves] had refus'd a Pass to the Vessel he had provided for himself and some Necessaries, to Elizabeth Island. I pray'd with him. went to M^{rs} Foyes at Milton. met M^{rs} Jones; promis'd f'm her an easy chair for M^r Bowdoin, M^{rs} Bowman having remov'd her own Furniture. drank Coffee at Sister Gardiner's. slept and Horse kept at Mad^m Foyes. The first Visit after the Death of dear Mother Cooper.² Saw as we were going to Bed a great Fire in Boston.

Thursday. 18. Breakfast at M^{rs} Foyes. Call'd at M^{rs} Jones. She has sent at my Desire the easy Chair and Mad^m Foye another. call'd at M^r Bowdoin's. found him a little reliev'd but still dangerous. wrote to D^r Bulfinch about my Servants and Books and Furniture in Boston. heard that our Meeting House and a great Number of Houses around it were burnt. came to Head Quarters at Roxbury: found that the Fire³ had consum'd many Stores on the South Side the Swing Bridg, the whole Loss computed at 20 000 Sterling. the General had before taken all the Engines under his Order. The Inhabitants were not allow'd to work at the Fire in the Begining; and the Souldiers knew not how to manage in such a Case with their Dexterity. Din'd at M^{rs} Hyslop's, with D^r Chauncy and Lady; M^r Hunt, M^r Adams &c. drank Coffee at Capt Segars at little Cambridg. invited in there as we came along by our dear Friends M^r and M^{rs} Scott and her Sister Sally, whom we saw with Pleasure out of Boston. slept at M^r S. Horse at R.

Friday. 19th May. about 10 o Clock saw our good Friends at M^r Savages in their Way to Princetown. they left us at eleven. We din'd at M^r Savages. Drank Coffee at Sister Cooper's. slept at S. Horse at Russell's.

Saturday. din'd at M^r S. slept there Horse at Russell's.

Lora's day. 21. May. pch'd all day at Concord M^r Emerson for me at Groton. din'd at his house. drank Coffee at Sister Coopers with B'. sleep't at Mr. S. Horse at Russell's.

Monday 22 Rainy day din'd at M^r S. slept there. Horse at Russell's.

Tuesday 23 Went in my chaise in the Morning to Watertown. din'd at M^{rs} Storer's. drank Coffee at M^{rs} Edward Greens Mrs Cooper at Mr. S. all day. slept there. Horse at Russell's.

Wednesday 24th Went with my Chaise and Nabby to Cambridg. din'd at Mr Dennies. went to Head Quarters. M^{rs} Cooper din'd at M^r S. Slept there Horse at R.

¹ Habijah Savage, the father of James Savage, the distinguished antiquary.

² Mary (Foye) Cooper, step-mother of the diarist, who died at Milton in April, 1774.

³ Cf. Diary of John Tudor, p. 55; Diary of John Rowe, in *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.*, second series, X. 92.

Thursday 25. We din'd at Mr Savages. M^r Wadsworth and Gill with us. after dinner M^r C. and Nabby went to Concord drank Coffee at M^r Betons. slept at S. Horse at Russells.

26. We Din'd at Cap't Baldwin's with Sister Cooper, and drank Coffee. Slept at S. Horse at R.

May 27. Saturday. Sat out in the Morn^g. 8^o Clock in my Chaise for Groton, bated at White's of Acton din'd at M^r Newman of Lyttleton. drank Coffee with M^r Rogers¹ reach'd Groton at Sunset; Slept and Horse kept at D^r Prescott's.

28. Lord's day. Pch'd all day at Groton; spoke with M^r Dana after Service a.m. din'd at D^r Prescott's baptiz'd a child P.M. slept and Horse kept at D^r Prescott's. a brave Action of our Army this day at Noddle's and Hog Islands.²

29. Monday Sat out fm Groton ^oClock. stop'd at M^r Hall's Wesford. saw M^r Gray and Family there. proceeded to chalmsford. din'd at Col Stoddard's call'd at M^r Bridge's. he absent. went p.m. to M^r Cummin's³ of Billerica, saw M^r Mountford, Miss chandler Stoddard, Polly Turner, and other Boston friends. drank Coffee slept and Horse kept there.

30. Tuesday. sat out fm M^r Cummins 8^o Clock. a great Discharge of Guns fm towards Boston for more than an Hour had alarm'd the Country, call'd at Mr Pennyman's of Bedford. saw Molly Williams and her mother fm Boston, bated Horse. proceeded to Concord, from thence to Mr Savages, din'd there and drank Coffee Sister Cooper and Nabby wth us. Slept there. Horse at Russell's. found the Firing to be only a mock Fight of the Regulars at Boston.

31. Wednesday. Went in my chaise with Nabby to Watertown, heard President Langdon preach before the Congress a well adapted Sermon. as great a Number of Ministers as usual on Election day. They din'd by Invitation of the Congress at Coolidg's Tavern. handsomely entertained. D^r Warren President of the Congress attended the Ministers most obligingly, and did the Honors of the Table. They form'd a Convention immediately after dinner, chose former Scribe⁴ and Treasurer. M^r Parkman⁵ Moderator. voted no Collection. chose Myself, M^r Cook, Shute, Bridg, Williams a Committee to draft an Address to the Congress, testifying our Respect and Confidence, and offering to supply the Army with Chaplains fm our own Number without Stipend.⁶ Address accepted and presented. Mrs Cooper din'd at Savages, and drank

¹ Probably the Rev. Daniel Rogers (H.C. 1725), for half a century minister of Littleton.

² Noddle's Island, now East Boston; Hog Island, otherwise known as Breed's Island. For an account of this affair see Diary of John Tudor, pp. 55-57; Journal of Timothy Newell, in *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, fourth series, I. 262; Diary of Ezekiel Price, in *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 1863-64, p. 186.

³ The Rev. Henry Cuming, D.D. (H.C. 1760), minister of Billerica.

⁴ The Rev. Amos Adams (H. C. 1752), minister of Roxbury.

⁵ The Rev. Ebenezer Parkman (H. C. 1721), first minister of Westborough.

⁶ See *Journ. Prov. Cong. Mass.*, pp. 283, 284, 290.

Coffee at Sister Cooper's Lodgings. Slept at S. Horse at Russell's. I din'd with Ministers. Nabby at Mr Hall's.

June 1. Went 8^o Clock with Nabby in my Chaise to Watertown, at wch Time divine Service of Convention begun, and was over wn I reachd Watertown. M^r Stevens¹ pch'd. went to Convention at Coolidg's. I drafted a Vote respecting Chaplains, as I did the Address yesterday, din'd at Fowl's with M^r John Pitts² &c Nabby at M^m Hunts. I visited p. m. Mrs Wendell, Mrs. Phillips and Family. Nabby drank Coffee at Mrs Hall's. slept at S. Horse at Russell's.

2. Friday. Din'd at M^r Savages. Visited with M^r Cooper M^r Lawrence and Family p. m. found on my Return home M^r Coburn and Wife, who slept with us. Horse at Russell's.

3. Saturday. At home din'd at M^r Savages. M^r Savage, Ray, Melvill &c drank Coffee with us at Nabbys Room Slept at Savages. Horse at Russell's.

4. Pch'd at Weston both parts of the day M^r Woodward at Watertown. M^r Thaxter³ for me at Weston. We dind with Nabby at M^r Woodward's. Horse kept all day at M^r Josiah Smith's. return'd after Service p. m. to M^r S. B^t and Sister Cooper and Nabby drank Coffee, and supp'd with us. Slept at M^r S. Horse at Russell's.

5. Monday. Went with M^r Cooper in my chaise to Billerica: call'd at M^r Lawrence's and Pennyman's. last not at home. din'd with Col Thompson at Billerica. drank Coffee with M^r Green and Family. at Lincoln, slept at S. Horse at R.

6. Tuesday. We din'd at home. Went with my Wife in our chaise and Nabby and M^r Melvill to M^r Inches drank Coffee slept at S. Horse at R.

7. Went after Breakfast in my chaise with my Wife to Holliston. bated at Gleason's Framingham. went thro a woody Romantic Way to M^r Prentiss's in all 20 Miles. Dind at his House with our dear Friends Capt and Mrs Freeman. slept and Horse kept there.

8. Din'd at Mr Prentiss' with our Friends. sat out early after Dinner. came a shorter and smoother way than we went, bated at Gleason's. drank Coffee at Capt How's at Weston by whom and Mrs How we were most obligingly invited and kind[ly] treated. found at my Return home M^r Beton of Concord had sent me a fine Leg of Pork. slept at S. Horse at R.

9. Friday. We din'd at home; Nabby with us, on M^r Beton's fine Leg of Pork roasted &c Paid M^r Savage in full for our Board to this Day; deducting whole days w'n both of us were absent; but not single Dinners. Slept at S. Horse at Russell's.

10. Saturday: Advanc'd to M^r. Joseph Russell 7 Dollars. Went in my chaise after Breakfast with M^r Cooper to Billerica. call'd at M^r

¹Presumably the Rev. Benjamin Stevens, D. D. (H. C. 1740), of Kittery.

²John Pitts (H. C. 1757), a merchant of Boston, delegate to the Provincial Congress and afterwards a member of the Council.

³Probably the Rev. Joseph Thaxter (H. C. 1768), chaplain of Colonel Prescott's regiment, and afterwards minister of Edgartown.

Lawrence Door. din'd at M^r. Pennyman's. Left my Horse in his Pasture, by his offer and took his in my chaise. Drank Coffee at Mr. Cummins slept and Horse kept there.

11. *Lord's d.* Pch'd all day at Billerica, baptiz'd i. din'd and slept at M^r Cummins. Visited in the Evg by Col Thompson and D^r Danforth. M^r Cummins pch'd for me at Groton. He sat out on Saturday before I arriv'd, and return'd home this Evening.

12. *Monday.* Breakfasted at M^r Cummin's. call'd at Mr Pennyman's of Bedford took back my own Horse. din'd at Capt Smiths of Lincoln on a roasted Turkey. call'd at M^r Lawrence's and Green's Door p. m. drank Coffee with Sister Cooper; met there Cos^o Jacob and Wife. slept at S. Horse at Russell's.

13. *Tuesday.* We Went with my Horse and chaise to M^r Woodward's. Association Meeting. an agreeable day. M^m Cooper din'd at M^m Baldwin's. She went with her p. m. to Newton and visited Nabby and Betsy Bulfinch. I walk'd home in the Evg. M^m Cooper return'd in the chaise. slept at S. Horse at Russell's. Nabby sat off with Mr. Scot's Serv't Richard in his chaise for Princeton after Breakfast.

14. Went wth my Wife with my Horse and Chaise after Breakfast to Medford. din'd wth M^r Payne's Family at their Lodgings at Brook's. Mrs

[A part of the Diary is here missing]

M^r Lowell spent Evg and slept with us at S. Horse at R.

23. [June] We sat out with my Horse and chaise after Breakfast. went thro Lincoln and Bedford to Billerica. din'd at M^r Stern's. call'd at Brother Cummins. slept at M^r Bridg's Chelmsford. Horse there.

24. Went a. m. to Dunstable din'd at M^r Pitts'. slept and Horse there. Visited p. m. by James Ting¹ Dr. Loring etc.

25. *Lord's day.* I pch'd both Parts of the Day at Dunstable. din'd at M^r Pitts'. read p. m. Proclamation fm Provincial Congress for reviving Observation of the Sabbath. spoke after reading it 7 or 8 Minutes extempore. Hon^t M^r Russell and Family, Capt Henley, John Winslow, and Tho^o Russell and Families attended divine Service. Drank Coffee with M^r Pitts and Family at Col. John Tyng's. slept at M^r Pitts. Horse there.

26. *Monday.* return'd to Chelmsford. din'd at Col. Stoddard's. met there Capt. Winslow. Col Stoddard and Lady kindly accompanied us over Carlston's Bridg to Tewksbury in our Way to Andover. Visited in the last Place Mr Appleton's Family. He at Cambridg. met there Capt Bradford and Wife. drank Coffee, slept, and Horse there.

27. *Tuesday.* M^r Abbott and Wife visited us this Morng. Went with us to M^r Halls and Families. to Dr. Winthrop² and Ladies Lodgings:

¹ James Tyng and Colonel John Tyng, *infra* (H. C. 1725), of Dunstable, were both delegates to the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts.

² John Winthrop, LL.D., F.R.S. (H. C. 1732), Hollis Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy at Harvard College, a fellow of the Corporation, and a member of the Council of Massachusetts.

where we saw M^r Tom Winthrop. M^r Phillips and Daughter. visited Brother Trench. met there brother Holt. call'd at M^r Phillips Jun^r saw M^m Noyes and her Sister Mad^m Bromfield and Daughter. Din'd at Brother Symme's: ¹ receiv'd in a most obliging Manner by him and Family and Billy Powell and Wife who lodg there: their Daughter entertain'd us with her Voice and Harpsicord. went p. m. to Rowley. call'd at Mr Chandler's. Drank Coffee at Mr Parsons² of Byfield, with Judg Trowbridge. ³ went to Dummer School. saw dear little Sammy⁴ well. slept and Horse there.

28. *Wednesday.* Hir'd an Horse of Mr Hale, went with Sammy to N. Port.⁵ bought cloaths for him. call'd at Mr Greenleaf's, Carters, Capt Tracy's, M^r Ellis Gray and Mother and Family. call'd at Ruth Mawgridg's Lodgings saw her well. met Capt Gray's Wife. return'd. din'd at Dummer School. sat out for Ipswich. call'd there at M^m Andrews Lodgings. found her sick of a Fever pray'd with her. slept and Horse at Br. Dana's.⁶

29. *Thursday.* Detain'd by Rain there. visited M^r Story and Family. His son the Minister and Wife being there. M^m Story the Elder ill, and had buried a Daughter yesterday pray'd with the Family. Coffee at Br. Dana's. Slept and Horse there.

30. *Friday.* Left B^r Dana's after Breakfast. Call'd at M^r Hitchcock's Beverly: he abroad. din'd at Mr w^m Davis at Danvers. slept at M^r Turell's Medford. Horse there.

July 1. Went early to visit M^m Newell and Payne's Family. at M^r Brook's: not at home. proceeded for Groton. bated at Hartwell's gratis. Din'd at D^r Lee's: Concord. His son obligingly accompanied us towards Lyttleton. Coffee at M^m Newman's. slept there. Horse at M^r Tuthill's gratis.

2. *Lord's day.* Went early to Groton after Breakfast. pch'd all day. read Proclamation from Continental Congress for a Fast thro all the Colonies⁷ and f'm Pr. Congress respecting Sabbath. spoke extempore a few minutes upon the last. Din'd. Coffee, slept, and Horse at Dr Prescotts.

¹ The Rev. William Symmes, D.D. (1750), sometime tutor in Harvard College, and minister of Andover.

² The Rev. Moses Parsons (H. C. 1736), minister of Byfield parish in Newbury, and father of Theophilus Parsons, chief justice of Massachusetts.

³ Edmund Trowbridge (H. C. 1728), Judge of the Superior Court of Judicature of the Province. He was one of the judges at the trial of Capt. Preston and others concerned in the Boston massacre. Though attached to the royal government he did not approve of all its measures, and in 1772 resigned his office and retired to private life.

⁴ Samuel Cooper Johonnot (H. C. 1783), a grandson of the diarist, and bred to the law. In 1793 he was appointed consul of the United States at Demerara, where he died in 1806.

⁵ Newburyport.

⁶ The Rev. Joseph Dana, D.D. (Yale Coll. 1760), for more than sixty years minister of Ipswich.

⁷ *Journ. Prov. Cong. Mass.*, pp. 342, 392, 393, note.

3. *Monday.* Visited by Capt Sartell D' Prescot had my Horse shoed at his own Expence. Came by Mistake the Westford Road to Concord. Din'd at Chamberlain's Tavern. Coffee at M' Emersons, with M' Farrar, M" Dunn and Dickman call'd at Sister Cooper's. slept at S. Hor[s]e at R.

4. *Tuesday.* Din'd at home. bought 500^{lb} of Hay of James Adams. Sister Cooper and Cousin Judy drank Coffee with us. Slept at Savages Horse at Russell's.

5. *Wednesday.* Went in my Horse and chaise with Mrs Cooper to Cambridg. She din'd with Stuart Hastings.¹ I waited on General Washington, Lee, Major Miffling², Reed³, &c din'd with General Washington, the other Gentlemen, Ward Ward, Putnam &c. Went p. m. to the Lines at Prospect Hill.⁴ Saw the Encampment of the British Troops on Bunkers Hill. drank Coffee with M" Newell, Mr. Payne and Family. Supped and slept at M' Turells with M' Rogers of Exeter, and M' Pool's Daughters. Horse there.

6. *Thursday.* Went after Breakfast to Mr Payne's; spent an Hour there with our Friends: proceeded down Menotomy Road to Cambridg. Went to Major Johonnots⁵ Quarters, my Wife din'd there. I din'd at Stuart Hasting's. Call'd at the Room of Committee of Safety, and convers'd with them. met at Maj' Johonnets' Quarters Col Bowers and Lady. call'd at Congress. Receiv'd Letters from John and Sam' Adams and M' Cushing bro't by General Washington. slept at Savages. Horse for the first night at M' Hagar's.

7. *Friday.* We din'd at M' Savage's. Hir'd an Horse of Mr Bigelow for our Chaise. M" Cooper went with Mr Harry Savage after Dinner to see Abby at Princetown. She Slept at Mad" Gardiners of Stow. I wrote Letters to Messrs Adams, Hancock, Cushing, Dr Franklin, Madam Hancock. Slept at Savages. Horse at Hagar's.

8. *Saturday.* Finishd my Letters din'd and slept at Savages. Mrs Cooper reach'd M' Scotts at Princetown about 3 o Clock. She slept there and had the Pleasure of finding our dear Daughter and good Friends well there.

9. Attend'd divine Service at Weston. din'd with my Wife at M' Woodwards. I pray'd p. m. slept at S. Horse at Hagars.

10. *Monday.* Extreme hot. I din'd at S. rode p. m. on my Horse to M' Inche's: M" C. sat out from Princetown with M' Harry Savage between 5 and 6 o Clock. They din'd at M' Goss': Bolton; and arriv'd

¹ Jonathan Hastings (H. C. 1730), from 1750 to 1779 steward of the College.

² Thomas Mifflin, of Pennsylvania, *aide-de-camp* to General Washington; afterwards major-general in the American army, president of Congress, and governor of Pennsylvania.

³ Joseph Reed, of Pennsylvania, aid and secretary to General Washington; afterwards brigadier-general, member of Congress, and president of Pennsylvania.

⁴ Washington to the President of Congress, July 10; in Sparks, III. 17.

⁵ Gabriel Johonnot, son-in-law of Dr. Cooper. He was lieutenant colonel of the 14th Continental regiment, otherwise known as the Marblehead regiment, commanded by Colonel John Glover.

at M^r Savage's between 10 and eleven in the Evg: where we slept. my Horse at Hagar's: Hir'd Horse at Savages Barn.

11. Spent the Day at home, where we slept. extreme hot. Horse at Hagars.

12. *Wednesday.* Went with M^r Cooper in our Horse and chaise, in Company with M^r and M^m Savage to Cambridge: my Wife din'd with them at Stuart Hastings Table. I din'd with the Committee of Safety, among other good Dishes an excellent corn'd Cod. Soon after Dinner a very Severe Storm of Thunder, and plenteous Rain. after the Rain, waited on General Washington, Lee, &c. gave my Letters to Friends at Philadelphia to the Care of Secretary Reed. Return'd and reach'd home about 9 o Clock. Slept at S. Horse at Hagars.

13. *Thursday.* Sat out with Mrs Cooper in our own chaise and Horse for Holliston. Call'd at Brother Woodward's—not at home—at M^r Dunbars—not at home. stop'd and cool'd and refresh'd my Self at Farmer Hastings': the Woman at home and very hospitable. din'd at M^r Demings of Needham. saw there Mr Clough of Boston, and Mrs Edes of Charlestown. met M^r Benj^a Eustis and Daughter, and Daughter of Widow West, who inform'd me her Mother died about a Fortnight ago at Waltham. Call'd at M^r S. Well's, Natick. saw his Wife and Brother Arnold. Call'd at M^r Badgers,¹ at Capt Newell's, Sherburn. saw him and Family, Miss Sarah Jackson. M^r Ezek^l Hall and Lady: who treated me with a Glass of Dorchester Ale. Call'd at President Lockes,² saw him and Lady and Professor Sewall's Lady. arriv'd before Sunset at M^r Prentice's. Found Capt Freeman and Lady and all our good Friends well. Much fatigued with Riding and Heat, having come about 20 Miles.

14. *Friday.* Still fatigued and unwell, tho most kindly receiv'd by our very dear and obliging Friends the Capt. and M^m. Freeman at their own Apartments. pass'd the day most agreeably with them. saw Mr Brown of Sherburn p. m. rode about an Hour with Capt Freeman in his Chaise. slept and Horse there.

15. *Saturday.* Din'd at Capt Freemans Lodgings. Drank Coffee with their Neighbor Newton.

16. *Lord's day.* pch'd a. m. for M^r Prentiss, and pray'd. He pray'd p. m. I pch'd.

17. *Monday.* visited with Capt Freeman and Lady Mr Townsend and Family at their Lodgings in Hopkinton Col Jones House. din'd there. an agreeable Day. Returned to M Prentiss in the Evg.

18. *Tuesday.* Went in my Horse and chaise with M^r Cooper accompanied with Capt Freeman and Wife to Medfield. Din'd at M^r Prentiss' Jun^r. Visited M^m Adams p. m. Mrs Plimpton. M^m Chauncy, M^m Hyslop. Mr Townsend. Slept and Horse at M^r Prentiss' Jun^r.

¹ The Rev. Stephen Badger (H. C. 1747), missionary to the Indians at Natick.

² The Rev. Samuel Locke, D.D. (H. C. 1755), minister of Sherborn, and sometime president of Harvard College.

19. *Wednesday.* Return'd to Capt Freeman's Lodgings at Holliston a. m. din'd with them and Slept.

20. Fast by Proclamation of Continental Congress thro all the Colonies. Mr Prentiss pch'd all day. I pray'd a. m.

21. *Friday.* Sat out early for Weston. call'd at D^r Locke's Sherburne at Capt Newell's, at M^r Badger's Natick. bated Horse there. call'd at Col Jones and saw Miss Sally Hatch. at M^r Fishers Needham: M^r Barrel and Lady and Deacon Storer's Lodgings. They absent. Din'd there. Most kindly receiv'd by M^r Fisher and Family. He accompanied us p. m. to Weston. Drank Coffee at Mr. Woodward's. slept at S. Horse at Hagars. found Brother Thomas¹ at Mr Savages, who had been there f'm Thursday Evg. the 13th. a Week.

22. *Saturday.* M^m Cooper went with Mr Rea in my Chaise and Horse to Cambridg. She din'd at Col Johonnot's Lodgings. and return'd in Evg. I din'd at S. we slept there. Horse in his Stable. B^r Thomas went to live at Widow Hagar's.

23. *Lord's day.* M^m Cooper and I din'd at M^r Lawrence's.² I pch'd for him all day. he pray'd p. m.

24. *Monday.* I went with M^r Rea to Cambridg. met Capt Freeman by Appointment at Watertown. Went with him to General Washington's. saw him, General Gates, M^r Reed. Din'd with Cap't Freeman at Col Johonnot's Quarters. procur'd a Place in the Army and Cloathing &c for B^r Thomas. Return'd in the Evg. we slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

25. *Tuesday.* At home all day. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's. Tommy went to the Army.

26. *Wednesday.* At home. Miss Usher and my Wife went p. m. to M^m Baldwin's and drank Coffee. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

27. *Thursday.* Merciful Rain. at home all day. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

28. *Friday.* Went with M^m Cooper in our Horse and chaise to Concord. call'd at M^r Hubbard's. din'd at M^r Beton's. drank Coffee on our Return at Capt Brown's slept at S. Horse at Hagars.

29. Sat out with my Horse and chaise after Dinner for little Cambridg. We Slept, and Horse there.

30. *Lord's day.* Went after Breakfast to Watertown. I preach'd there both Parts of the day. We drank Coffee and Din'd at D. Fisk's. I pray'd at Funeral of—return'd to M^r Dennies by Sunset. Slept, and Horse there. Wak'd by 1^o Clock in the Morn^g with Cannonading all round the Lines and in the Harbour of Boston. saw George Tavern in Flames. Cannon and small Arms continu'd till 5^o Clock, with but few slain on either Side.³

¹ Thomas Cooper, a younger brother of the diarist.

² At Lincoln.

³ Cf. Diary of Ezekiel Price, in *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 1863-64, p. 201; Paul Lunt's Book, *ibid.*, 1871-73, p. 196; Diary of Benjamin Boardman, *ibid.*, 1891-92, p. 400; Frothingham, *Siege of Boston*, p. 230.

31. *Monday.* We went after Breakfast to Watertown. I attended Corporation and Overseer's Meeting there. din'd with Corporation¹ at Davis Tavern. M^{rs} Cooper at Deacon Fisk's. I went p.m. to visit Dr Appleton and pray'd with him, very low, we return'd to M^r Dennies. slept and Horse there.

Aug. 1. *Tuesday.* Went after Breakfast in my chaise and Horse with My Wife towards Salem. call'd at Col Johonnot's Quarters. saw young Allen's Funeral. din'd at Deacon Cheaver's Lynn End: call'd at Mr Prescott's Danvers. drank Coffee. Slept and Horse at M^r W^m Davis.'

2. Went in the Morn^g with my Wife M^r and M^{rs} Davis to Salem. din'd at Deacon Smith's, saw Several Military Companies exercise on the Common, in Company with Mess^{rs} Bernard's &c. Slept and Horse at Deacon Smith's.

Aug. 3. Din'd at D. Smith's. purchas'd Here for myself and for Nabby, Handkerchiefs &c. Went after dinner With D. Smith and Lady to M^r Davis. drank Coffee. slept and Horse there. M^{rs} Davis presented Nabby with a Pair of Shoes. 35/ O. Ten^r.

4. *Friday.* We left M^r Davis' after Breakfast. We din'd at General Lees Quarters at Medford in Company with M^{rs} Barnes of Marlboro, M^r Palfry &c. went after dinner to M^r Dennies Cambridg. slept and Horse there.

5. *Sat:* Return'd after Breakfast to Mr Savages. din'd and Slept there. Horse at Hagars.

6. *Lord's day.* Went with M^{rs} Cooper to Watertown. pch'd all day. we din'd at Madam Storer's, drank Coffee at D. Fisk's. slept and Horse there.

7. *Monday.* M^{rs} Cooper din'd at Mr Merritts. I at M^r Hunts. return'd to M^r Savages. slept and Horse there. Nabby return'd f'm Princeton.

8. *Tuesday.* We Went after Breakfast to Watertown. I attended Corporation and Overseer's Meeting. din'd with them at Davis' Tavern M^m C. at Brother Cooper Lodgings in Watertown. return'd to Mr Savages. slept and Horse there.

9. *Wednesday.* We din'd at Savage's. drank Coffee in Nabby's Chamber at M^r Russell's. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

10. *Thursday.* M^r Cooper went, (my chaise and Horse) with Nabby to Cambridg: They din'd at Col Johonnot's: I din'd at S. They return'd in the Evg. we slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

11. *Friday.* We din'd at Savages. went after dinner (my Horse and chaise) to Widow Bigelow's. drank Coffee there. call'd upon M^{rs} Baldwin. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

12. *Sat.* Went with M^{rs} Cooper after Breakfast (my Horse and Chaise) to Watertown. I din'd at M^r Hunt's with Committee of Supplies. M^{rs} Cooper proceeded to Medford, and din'd at M^r Turell's

¹ The fellows of the Corporation were Nathaniel Appleton, John Winthrop Andrew Eliot, Samuel Cooper, and John Wadsworth.

She return'd to Watertown 6 o Clock. We proceeded to M^r Dennies little Cambridg. Slept and Horse there.

13. *Lord's day.* I preach'd both Parts of the Day at little Cambridg: M^r Bigelow for me at Watertown. We Dined at M^r Dennies in Company with L^e Corn f'm Statia, Mr W^m Barrell f'm Philadelphia. We supp'd there with the same Company: Slept and Horse there.

14. I Went (Mr Dennies Horse and Chaise) with him to the Lines at Roxbury. saw the Fort &c. call'd upon General Thomas. return'd and din'd with M^m Cooper at his House slept and Horse there.

15. *Tuesday.* Went with M^m Cooper, my Horse and Chaise, thro Brooklyne to upper Roxbury: call'd at M^r Walters: I din'd at Noah Davis': M^m Cooper proceeded to Isaac William's: saw t e Trunks of Apparell, &c. She din'd there: return'd to Brooklyne. slept at M^m Hyslop's. kindly entertain'd by her Son David. Horse there.

16. *Wednesday.* Went with M^m C. my Horse and chaise to Medford. din'd with M^r Turell. met Mrs Newell, Payne &c to whom we design'd a Visit. drank Coffee at Col Johonnot's Quarters Cambridg. went to Mr Dennies. slept and Horse there.

17. Went with M^m C. my H: and Ch. to Watertown. saw Co^t Hancock, Mr. Adams, Pair, Cushing, &c. Din'd at M^m Hall's with Col Warren¹ and Lady, M^r Arnold Wells and Lady: Mess^m Adams, &c. return'd to Savages. slept there. Horse at Hagar's.

18. Went with M^m C. (my H. and Ch.) to Darch's Newton to visit Betsy Bulfinch dangerously sick. pray'd there. return'd to M^r age's. din'd there with M^r Woodward and Lady. slept there. Horse at Hagar's. Mercy Scollay and General Warren's little Daughters lodg'd with us.

19. *Saturday.* At home all day. wrote Letters to M^m Handcock, and Mr. Eliot² at Fairfield. Deacon Jeffries visited us p. m. Nabby went in M^m Scollay's Horse and chaise to M^m Cockran's Watertown.

20. Went with M^m C. (my H: and ch.) to Watertown. pch'd all day. We din'd at Deacon Fisk's. went about Sunset to Mr. Dennie's. slept and Horse there.

21. *Monday.* Went (in my H. and Ch.) to Watertown. I din'd at Madam Storer's M^m C. went with Nabby to the Lines at Charlestown. I attended p. m. Committee of Overseers. obtain'd Leave to lodg occasionally in M^r Remington's Chambers. met M^r Tho^r Dennie who desir'd me to write to Gen^t Washington &c we return'd with him to his Father's. slept and Horse there.

22. *Tuesday.* M^m C went in the Morn^s (my H. and Ch) to Watertown I accompanied Mr. Tho^r Dennie to Cambridg to Head Quarters Major Mifflin's &c. He then carried me to Watertown. Attended

¹ James Warren, of Plymouth, a graduate of Harvard College in 1745. He was a delegate to the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, and on the death of General Warren was chosen speaker. He married Mercy Otis, the talented sister of the patriot.

² The Rev. Andrew Eliot, minister of Fairfield, Conn., was a graduate of Harvard in 1762, and sometime librarian, tutor, and fellow of the college.

Overseer's Meeting. din'd with them at Coolidg's. slept at Mr. Remington's Chamber. Horse at Fisk's.

23. *Wednesday.* We breakfasted at Miss Cook's with M^r Warren Adams, &c. I din'd at Deacon Fisk's. M^r C. at her chamber. drank Coffee at M^r Cockran's. return'd to Savage's. slept there. Horse at Hagar's.

24. Din'd at Savages. M^r C. drank Coffee there p. m. I visited Mr. Inches; went on my Horse in Saddle. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

25. At Savages till p. m. went with M^r C. (my H and Ch) to Baldwin's. drank Coffee there. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

26. *Saturday.* M^r C. din'd at S. I at M^r Inches. slept at S. Horse at H. This night Detachm^t took Possession of plough'd Hill.¹

27. *Lord's day.* Went with M^r C. (my H. and Ch) to Watertown. we din'd at D. Fisk's. I pch'd all day. D' Appleton abroad p. m. saw 120 Riflers f'm Maryland on their March to the Camp. went to M^r Dennie's. slept and Horse there.

28. *Monday.* At M^r Dennies din'd. went to Cambridg Forenoon Nabby came to us in the Evening. slept and Horse there.

29. Great Storm. at M^r Dennies. M^r Barrell and L^e Corn din'd with us. slept and Horse there.

30. Rainy day still at M^r Dennies. din'd and spent the Evg with same Company slept and Horse there.

31. Rainy. still at Mr. Dennies: din'd and supp'd with same Company. slept and Horse there.

1. *Sept'r. Fryday.* Went with my Horse and Chaise to Cambridg din'd at Mr. Dennie's with Mr L^e Corn. went p. m. to Mr. Savages. slept there. Horse at Hagar's.

2. *Saturday.* At Savages all day. slept there. H at H.

3. Went (my H. and Ch) with M^r C. to Watertown. pchd all day. slept at D. Fisk's Horse there.

4. *Monday.* Went (my H. and Ch) with M^r C. to Cambridg. Corporation Meeting. She din'd at Mr. Turell's I at Steward Hastings. Came to Mr. Dennies. slept and Horse there.

5. *Tuesday.* At M^r Dennies unwell. slept and Horse there. unable to attend Overseer's and Corporation Meet^s at Watertown. M^r C. and M^r Dennie went to Watertown my Horse and chaise. M^r Rand visited us.

6. Still unwell at M^r Dennies. Went in my Horse and chaise to Thompson's Shop Brooklyne. p. m. rode 6 Miles. slept and Horse at Dennies.

7. *Thursday.* Went with M^r C (my Horse and chaise) to Cambridg: rode round the Lines at Cambridg: beyond M^r Inman's. visited M^r Johnnot's Quarters saw D^r Bond. rode 10 Miles. Return'd and din'd at M^r Dennies. Spent afternoon at M^r Faneuils. return'd and slept at Mr D. Horse there.

¹ Ploughed Hill, known later as Mount Benedict, stood in the north-westerly part of Charlestown,—afterwards incorporated as the town of Somerville. See Washington's *Writings*, ed. Sparks, III. 71; Frothingham, *Siege of Boston*, pp. 233, 234.

8. *Friday.* I went with Mr Tho^r Dennie to Cambridg. din'd with him at Col. Glover's Quarters. M^r Johonnot absent. return'd by Watertown. M^r Cooper went with Nabby to M^r Williams at Roxbury: din'd there saw our Trunks, they drank Tea at Mr Pierpoints. Spent the Evg. and slept at M^r Dennies. Horse there. M^r James Dennie and Flag f'm N. Port and Major——f'm N. Hampshire.

Sept^r. 9. M^r C. went (my Horse and Ch) to Weston. din'd at M^r Savage's. I din'd at M^r Dennie's with B^r Cooper. Tommy Bryant very ill. I gave him a Puke. Mrs C. return'd in Evg. we slept and Horse at Dennies.

10. *Lord's day.* Exchang'd M^r Coggins. He pch'd all day for me at Watertown. I for him at little Cambridg. pray'd at Warren's child's Funeral. slept and Horse at M^r D.

11. Went with M^r Cooper (my Horse and chaise) to Framingham. din'd at M^r Woodward's: drank Coffee with Capt Freeman at Framingham. Married Henry Prentiss and Ruth Freeman. Fee i Guinea. slept and Horse there.

12. *Tuesday.* Visited M^r Bridg and M^r Savage a. m. 3 Miles my Horse &c. Din'd with our Friends at their Lodgings. M^r Buckminster's. slept and Horse there. visited p. m. with our Friends Mr Stone at Sthboro 10 Miles.

13. Went with our Friends to Hopkintown; din'd at Co^r Jones' Invitation at his Home, with Mr Townsend &c. returned to Cap't Freeman's Lodgings. slept and Horse there. 10 Miles.

14. *Thursday.* rode upon my Horse in a Saddle 9. Miles. a. m. Din'd with our Friends at M^r Buckminster's. slept and Horse there.

15. Took Leave of our good Friends. Return'd and din'd at M^r Savages. Neighbor Right buried. slept at S. Horse at Hagar's.

16. *Saturday.* Din'd at S. went, (my Horse and Ch) after Dinner to M^r Dennies. found Nabby unwell. slept and Horse.

17. *Lord's day.* Breakfasted at Mr. Dennies. went to Watertown, pch'd all day and administer'd L. S. din'd at Deacon Fisk's. return'd after Service p. m. to M^r Dennie's. slept and Horse there. saw Couzin Sally Chardon as I pass'd Mr Zegur's¹ House.

18. Went after Breakfast to Watertown saw D^r Winthrop sick. Met D^r Appleton and Chauncy there. Din'd with M^r C. at D. Fisk's. visited p. m. Mr. Prentice's Family and pray'd there remarkably visited with Sickness and repeated Deaths. return'd to M^r Savage's. M^r Whitney presented us on our Return with two fine Chickens. Capt Freeman and Wife slept with us at S. Horse at Hagars.

19. *Tuesday.* Went with Capt Freeman and Wife to Concord. visited with them M^r Hubbard, and Emerson: The latter and Wife out of Town: our Friends engag'd M^r Hubbard to take th'r Son at Board proceeded with them to Sudbury thinking to go to Worcester. We din'd at Rice's Tavern. Soon after getting into our chaises it rain'd hard. Capt Freeman and Wife return'd to Framingham. We to

¹ Segar, also spelled Seger.

Weston. call'd at M^r Coats' Sudbury. rode 22 Miles in all. slept at Mr. S. Horse at Hagars.

20. *Wednesday.* At M^r Savages all day slept there. Horse at Hagars.

21. *Thursday.* At M^r Savages all day. slept there. H: at Hagars.

22. *Friday.* M^m C. went after Breakfast (my Horse and Ch.) to Cambridge. spent the Day there, and return'd in the Evening. I went with M^m Melvill (her Chaise and Horse) to Concord. We din'd at good M^r Beton's after Dinner She slipt into my Hand, in a most obliging Manner a Bill of 20/ Lawf. Money. return'd p. m. to M^r Savages, the Weather rainy. M^m C. arriv'd soon after. slept there. H. at Hagars.

23. *Saturday.* Paid M^m Savage 27 Pounds ten Shillings O. Ten^l in full for our Board, (deducting Absence) f'm 10 June to this day, inclusively. din'd at M^r Savages: went with M^m Cooper, (my Horse and Chaise) to little Cambridge. slept at M^r Dennies. Horse there.

24. *Lord's day.* Went to Watertown (my H. and ch) pch'd there all day. return'd to Mr. Dennie's. slept and H. there.

25. *Monday.* Went after Breakfast with M^r C. (my H: and Ch) to Milton. din'd at B^r Gardiner's,¹ visited Mad^m Foye found her in her own House, call'd at M^r John Adam's. drank Coffee slept at Col. Quincy's. Horse there.

26. *Tuesday.* Went f'm Col Quincy's 9 ^oClock for Kingston. bated my Horse at Widow Gardiners on Hingham Plains. din'd at M^r Baldwin's; Hannover. arriv'd at Mr Rand's, Sunset. slept and Horse there. found the Family, and dear Sister Rand's² children well.

27. *Wednesday.* M^r Rand accompanied us to Plimpton, 6. Miles. visited M^r Parker the Pastor and his Colleague M^r Sampson. the former a Cancer in his Leg. Left Mr Rand there, proceeded with M^m C. to Middleboro. arrived at M^r Bowdoin's in Judg Olivers³ House about 12—13 Miles f'm M^r Rand's. most Kindly receiv'd. M^r Bowdoin better. din'd there. rode out with him in his Chaise p. m. 6 Miles. slept and Horse there.

28. *Thursday.* Took Leave of M^r Bowdoin and Family. He put into my Hands at parting a Bill of Sixe Pounds Lawf. Money, and a Chicken and Bottle of Wine into our Chaise. we call'd at M^r Perkins, Bridgwater, at Mr Porters. din'd at Curtiss' Tavern. met at Braintree, M^r Tafts Parish our Friend M^m Clark. drank Coffee, slept and supp'd with her. Horse at Mr Tafts: who with his Wife and D^r Porter spent the Evg with us at Capt Pennyman's, M^m Clark's Lodgings.

29. *Friday.* Came thro the blue Hills to Milton. went to Brush Hill, Timothy Tucker's House: din'd with M^r Sherburne and Family. gave us a Bottle of Kyan. came by the Paper Mills to Dorchester, by

¹ Dr. Samuel Gardner.

² Judith Cooper, who married first, Dr. John Sever (H. C. 1749), and secondly, William Rand, of Kingston, Mass. She died February 16, 1764, and left issue.

³ Peter Oliver, D.C.L. (H.C. 1730), Chief Justice of the Province.

Roxbury Meeting-House — Supp'd at M^r Pierpoint's with General Ward, M^r Conant, Willard of Mendam: Frost a Candidate &c M^r West¹ of Dartmouth. slept and Horse there.

30. At Breakfast a smart Cannonading f'm the Enemy on Lamb's Dam.² call'd at M^r Dennies, at Major Thompson's, at Watertown. din'd at Mr Savages. slept there. Horse at Hagar's.

1 Octr. *Lord's day.* Went with M^m Cooper my (Horse and chaise) to Deacon Fisk's. din'd there. pch'd all day Watertown. went after Service to Mr Dennie's Saw M^r Martin of R. Island. slept and Horse there.

2. *Monday.* Went to Corporation at Watertown, din'd there. (my Horse and Ch) M^m Cooper din'd at M^r Dennies. I return'd. slept and Horse there.

3. *Tuesday.* Went (my H: and ch) to Watertown Overseer's Meeting. din'd there. M^m C. at M^r Dennies. she with M^m Dennie visited Miss Boucher. I return'd Evg. slept and Horse at M^r Dennies.

4. Went with M^m C. (my H. and Ch) in Company with M^m Dennie and Boucher to Medford. din'd M^r Payne's Family. saw Ellis Gray and Lady. slept at Mr Turell's. Horse there.

5. *Thursday.* Detain'd by Rain at M^r T. I visited p. m. General Sullivan, at M^r Bishop's, M^r Osgood. slept and Horse at Mr T.

6. *Friday.* Came with M^m C. to Cambridge: thro Camp at Winter and Prospect Hills. saw General Washington Lee &c at the Top of the Hill: the former obligingly invited us to dine at head Quarters, visited M^m Miffling. I din'd with General W. M^m C. at Col. Johonnot's. return'd to M^r Savage's in Evg. slept there, and H. at Hagar's.

7. At Savages all day. slept there. H. at Hagar's.

8. *Lord's day.* Went (my H. and Ch) to Watertown: rainy Forenoon. pch'd there all day. visited M^r Baker sick. spent the Evg and slept at M^r Dennies. Horse there.

9. Sat out f'm thence for Worcester (my H. and Ch) din'd at Baldwin's. paid for Oats. Dinner gratis. we drank Coffee slept and Horse at Cap't Freeman's Lodgings, Framingham.

10. *Tuesday.* Went with our dear Friends Capt F. and Lady towards W. din'd at Cushing's. Shrewsbury. I visited M^r Sumner. reach'd M^r Williams's Worcester at 4 o'Clock. saw that Family M^r Royall &c we^{ll}. slept and Horse there.

11. Went M^r Williams H: and Ch. with M^m C. to Liecester: stopt at M^r Conchlyn's Door. went to Col Henshaws. all abroad but Col Jos. Henshaw. din'd with him. return'd. visited Cheeseman, More &c of Boston. visited M^r Manarty:³ who spent preceding Evg with us at M^r W^r with M^r Lyman of Hatfield and M^r Hub-

¹ Presumably the Rev. Samuel West, D.D. (H.C. 1754), minister of Dartmouth, and chaplain in the Revolutionary army. It was he who deciphered the letter of Dr. Benjamin Church.

² The position of a battery in Roxbury.

³ Perhaps Moriarty.

bard of . . . slept and H: at M^r William's. Much Thunder and severe Lightning f'm Sunset to 10^o Clock.

12. *Thursday.* Left our Friends. call'd at Landman's. We din'd M^r Stone's Capt Freeman and Lady Mr Bomen's [?] Lodgings. I heard him preach M^r Stones Lecture. return'd to Capt Freemans Lodgings. slept and H. there.

13. *Friday.* Din'd at the same place. Took Leave of our good Friends after Dinner. call'd at M^r Woodwards. drank Coffee. slept, and Horse at M^r Savages.

14. *Sat.* din'd at M^r Savage's. Went after Dinner to Mr Dennies. Slept and Horse there.

15. *Lord's day.* Pch'd all day at Watertown. baptiz'd 2. Drank Coffee at M^r Halls with Mrs. Warren, [illegible] Allyne Otis¹ and Lady &c. saw D^r Franklyn and Mr. Linch.² slept and Horse at Mr Cushing's Waltham.

16. *Mond.* Went with M^m C. (my H and Ch) to Cambridg. D^r Franklin &c absent at the Lines. I din'd with Stuart Hastings. M^m C. saw in the afternoon flat Bottom Boats in Cambridg River. the Troops embarked in th'm &c. Slept at Mr Dennies. Horse there.

17. Went f'm M^r Dennies (my H. and ch) to General Washington's. I din'd there. With D^r Franklin, the Committee of Continental Congress,³ M^r Bowdoin &c. M^m C. at M^r Dennies. she brot my H. and Ch. and carried me back there. slept and H. there.

18. *Wednesday.* Went my H. and Ch. to Watertown. saw D^r Prescott who paid me 60 £ O. Ten^r for six Sabbaths at Groton. We din'd at Deacon Fisk's. Came to Mr Savage's. Slept and Horse there.

19. *Thursday.* rainy. Came with M^m C. (my H. and Ch.) to Watertown. din'd by Invitation of the House of Representatives at Coolidge's Tavern with General Washington, the general Officers of the Army, Committee of Continental Congress. D^r Franklin, Col Garrison of Virginia, M^r Lynch of Carolina, Gov^r Cook⁴ of R. Island. Lt. Governor Grizzald⁵ of Connecticut, and a great Number of Gentlemen of this and other Colonies: the Council of Massachusetts &c. M^m C. din'd. We return'd to B^r Cushing's at Waltham. slept and Horse there.

20 *Fryday.* M^m Cooper went (my H. and Ch) to Mr Dennies. She din'd there. I accompanied her as far as Watertown. din'd with Speaker Warren and Lady at their Lodgings. M^r Cooper carried Nabby f'm M^r Dennies to our new Lodgings M^r Clark's⁶ Waltham. came back and return'd with me there. We slept and H there for first Time.

¹ Samuel Allyne Otis (H. C. 1759), brother of James Otis, and a delegate to the Continental Congress.

² Thomas Lynch, of South Carolina, delegate to the Continental Congress. His son, Thomas Lynch, Jr., was a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

³ Washington's *Writings*, ed. Sparks, III. 123, and note.

⁴ Nicholas Cooke.

⁵ Matthew Griswold, LL.D., chief justice of the Superior Court, and afterwards governor of Connecticut.

⁶ Perhaps Deacon John Clarke, one of the selectmen of Waltham.

21. M^r C. Nabby and myself din'd at M^r Clark's. slept and Horse there.

22. *Lord's day.* Went with M^r C. to Watertown. pch'd all day there. din'd at D. Fisk's. return'd to M^r Clark's. We and Nabby slept, and Horse there.

23. M^r C. went (my H. and ch) to M^r Savages din'd there with M^r Bowdoin, John Pitts &c. I din'd at Watertown M^m Storer's. Nabby at Russell's, carried there by her Mother. M^r C. return'd alone f'm Westown. I f'm Watertown. M^r Bowdoin and J. Pitts drank Coffee with us at M^r Clark's. M^r C. and I slept and Horse there.

24. *Tuesday.* Went with M^r C. to Watertown, Corporation and Overseer's Meeting; which fail'd by Presidents not coming. I din'd at Fowl's with M^r Bowdoin &c it being rainy, M^r C. went (my H. and ch) to Newtown after Hay. She din'd with Nabby Bulfinch at Durell's. We slept and Horse at M^r Clark's.

25. Nabby and Katy came f'm Westown to M^r Clark's a. m. We all din'd there. M^r C. went (my H: ch) to M^r Cushing's. We then sat out for Mr Dennies. M^r C. went to Newtown. return'd to M^r D. we slept and Horse there.

26. *Thursday.* I Went (my Horse and ch) to General Washington's to attend D^r Franklin, M^r Bowdoin, D^r Winthrop and Lady, to Middleboro', M^r Bowdoin's House. sat out about 2 "Clock. At M^r Pierpoint's Roxbury receiv'd M^r Cooper bro't there by M^r Dennie. We din'd at Col. Quincy's Braintree. slept and Horse there. D^r F. M^r B. slept there also. D^r W. and Lady at M^r Adam's.

27. sat out f'm Col. Quincy's 9 "Clock in Company with the above nam'd. Din'd at Col Howard's Bridgwater, M^r Bowdoin's Expence. reach'd his House Sunset. Spent the Evg most agreeably there. Slept and H. there.

28. *Saturday.* Din'd at M^r Bowdoins; M^r Conant added to the Company. Slept and H: there.

29. *Lord's day.* D^r Franklin left us 9 "Clock to proceed on his Journey. M^r Conant pch'd a.m. and administer'd L. S. we spent Interval at his House, drank Coffee there. I pch'd p.m. return'd with D^r W. and Lady, M^r Bowdoin &c to his House, slept and H: there.

30. *Monday.* We, with D^r Winthrop and Lady, left our dear Friends M^r B. and Family, 9 "Clock. having been entertain'd there in the most engaging Manner. We din'd at Turner's Tavern Braintree. Getting out of my Chaise, turn'd my Ankle and strain'd it greatly. Spent afternoon and slept at Mr. Clark's Lodgings. Capt Pennymann's. Kindly nurs'd there with my Lameness. Horse at B^r Taft's. D^r W. and Lady proceeded on their Journey. D^r Wales kindly dress'd my Ankle gratis.

31. *Tuesday.* Came to Madam Foyes. din'd slept and Horse there. kindly nurs'd there. Nancy Jeffries drank Coffee with Nabby at M^r Clark's.

Novr. 1. Wednesday. We came to General Ward's Quarters at M^r Pierpoints. I din'd there. M^r C. dind. saw Capt M^r pherson.¹ came to M^r Clark's. found Nabby well. slept and Horse there.

¹ Doubtless Duncan McPherson, who two months later fell at Quebec.

Novr. 2. Thursday. Mrs C. and I went my H: and ch to Westtown. din'd at M^r Savages. Nabby at M^r Cockran's. return'd to M^r Clark's slept and H. there.

Novr. 3. Friday. Rainy. Our little Family all at home. B^r Williams of Sandwich, and M^r Curtiss my former Parishioners drank Coffee with us. slept and Horse at home

Novr. 4. Went M^r Clark's Horse to Watertown. din'd with my little Family at home i. e. Mr Clark's. M^r James Dennie and B^r Cooper drank Coffee with us. slept and Horse there on M^r Clark's Hay still. In the Evg. my Hay f'm Watertown. 6^l and 1/2.

Novr. 5. Lord's day. Went to Watertown with M^r Cooper pch'd all day there, we din'd at Deacon Fisk's. Nabby at home all day. We return'd, in Evg. slept there. Horse on my own Hay.

N. 6. Monday. Our Family at home all day. I visited Mr Payne and Family p. m. D^r Langdon and Mr Wadsworth spent Evg. with me. did not sup. slept and H. at home.

Novr. 7. Tuesday. Went with Mr Calendar my H: and ch. to Watertown. Corporation and overseers Meeting. adjourn'd to——rainy day. I din'd with Corporation at Coolidge's. M^r Cooper and my Family at home. slept and H. there.

Novr. 8. Wednesday. Went to M^r Payne's a. m. alone. Welman put one Shoe on my Horse, paid. saw Mr Payne. din'd at home with all my Family. M^r Cooper and I visited p. m. Mrs Turell. We all slept, and H: at home. M^r Blanchard slept with us.

Novr. 9. Thursday. Went with M^r Cooper, my H: and ch: to Mr Dennies after dining at home with Mrs Blanchard. slept and H: there. M^r Blanchard slept with Nabby at M^r Clark's

Novr. 10. Friday. M^r Cooper and I all day at Mr Dennies slept and H: there. Nabby and M^r Blanchard at Mr Clark's

Novr. 11. Saturday. Went with M^r Cooper f'm M^r Dennies to old Cambridge. din'd with Nabby and M^r Blanchard at M^r Clark's. We all slept and H. there

Novr. 12. Went with M^r Cooper my H: and ch. to Watertown Nabby and M^r Blanchard went also. She din'd at Madam Hunts. M^r Cooper Nabby and I at Mr Fisk's. pch'd all day at Watertown. We all slept and H. at M^r Clark's.

Novr. 13. M^r Blanchard left us this Morn^g. Our Family din'd at home. Went with M^r Cooper, my H: and ch: p. m. to Menotomy.¹ slept and Horse at Mr Cook's.

Novr. 14. Tuesday. Sat out after Breakfast f'm Mr Cook's. call'd at Cooper's Tavern.² receiv'd of M^r Phillips White 10~~L~~ Lawf. Money

¹ Menotomy.

² This tavern, which stood where the Arlington House now stands, was kept by Benjamin Cooper. During the retreat from the fight at Lexington, April 19, 1775, it was entered by British soldiers, "and two aged gentlemen were most barbarously and inhumanly murdered by them." See deposition of Benjamin and Rachel Cooper, in *Journ. Prov. Cong. Mass.*, p. 678.

being Legacy left me by W^m White Esq^r proceeded to Medford, call'd at M^r Turell's. din'd at M^r Treadwell's Lynn. reach'd Salem slept and H. at Deacon Smiths. saw D^r Pemberton this Evg.

Novr. 15. Wednesday. Intended to have gone to Dummer School to see little Sammy. prevented by a great Storm. Din'd, slept, and H. at D. Smith's. M^r Bernard Jun^r and M^r Jackson of Newbury Port supp'd with us.

Novr. 16. Thursday. Cold and windy. Left Salem to return home. Roads bad by g^t Rains. Chaise Broke 2. Miles f'm Salem. assisted in mending it by Prurington and Varny Quakers din'd at Couzin Jacob Cooper's Quarters at Medford. slept and Horse at M^r Turell's.

17. Friday. Call'd at M^r Boylsts. bought a warming Pan. 3 Doll. a Stove and Frame 50 /. old Tenr, call'd at Mr Brook's Medford. at Col Johonnots Quarters. I din'd with M^r Leonard¹ at Connecticut Head Q^r. M^m C. return'd home p. m. found Polly Johnston with Nab by who had din'd with her and assisted altering her Gown.

Novr. 18. Saturday. Din'd at home. Polly Johnston again came after Breakfast, and din'd with us. I went my H: and ch. to Watertown p. m. return'd. slept. and H. at home.

Novr. 19. Went with M^m Cooper my H: and ch. to Watertown. I pch'd there all day. we din'd at Deacon Fisk's. Nabby din'd at home. attended p. m. Waltham.

Novr. 20. Went with M^m C. (my H. and Ch) to Weston. din'd with M^r Savage. return'd slept and H. at home.

21. Tuesday. Walk'd to Watertown a. m. We all din'd at home. slept and H. at home

22. Wednesday. rode (my H. and ch) to Watertown. We all din'd at home. B^r Cooper and Judy call upon us p. m. M^r James Denny invited us in Name of Family to dine at his Fathers to morrow, being Th-g. invited also by M^m Hunt Jun^r and old M^r Hunt: and M^r Halls. We all slept and H. at home. Salem Smith bro't M^m Melvill's Bed. paid him. Paid Billings Tailor.

23. Thursday. Pub. Thanksg. Went, my H: and ch. to Watertown. pch'd there. Went after Service with M^m C. to M^r Dennies. James Denny carried Nabby. We din'd with Capt Davis there, Miss Katy Wendell, Dr Fog of Fairfield &c. We came home, left Nabby there. slept and H: at home.

24. Friday. Walk'd a. m. to Watertown and return'd. Call'd at M^r Bemus' by the Way and thank'd him for the Frame of a Stove, He presented me. M^m C. and I din'd at home. Slept and H. at home. Nabby still at M^r Dennies M^r Payne and M^r Cushing drank Coffee with us. Deacon Storer and M^r Barrell call'd upon us, inform'd us of M^r Frank Green's Wife's Death.

25. Saturday. Rode (my H and ch) to Watertown. paid Davis Tavernkeeper his Note, 1. Doll. and Marshall in full for Candles.

¹ The Rev. Abiel Leonard, D.D. (H. C. 1759) chaplain of the Connecticut forces.

Din'd at home. B' Cooper came f'm Brewer's Tavern after slight Dinner and ate Fish with us: Sister Cooper came over after Dinner, and gave us a short Visit. walk'd to M^r Payne's Lodgings. slept and H: at home. Nabby still at Mr Dennie's.

26. *Sunday.* went (my H: and ch.) to Watertown. pch'd there all day: din'd at Deacon Fisk's. slept and H: at home. Nabby still at M^r D.

27. *Monday.* Deacon Storer and M^r Joshua Green call'd upon us this Morn*. They went to the Lines at Roxbury. carried a letter f'm M^m C. to her Brother. Nabby came home this Forenoon. Slept and H. at home.

28. *Tuesday.* M^r Jonathan Williams call'd and din'd with us I went p. m. to Watertown (my H: and ch) pray'd with the Town of Boston previous to th'r Choice of Representative in Room of D' Church.¹ John Brown chosen. Col Gerrish gave me a Letter f'm Master Moody² respecting Sammy. Slept and H: at home

29. *Wednesday.* Went in the Forenoon with Mrs C. (my H and ch to Cambridge. M^r Zephion Thayer paid me 26 L.M. Mrs C. din'd at Stuart Hastings. I call'd on M^r Leonard, Connecticut Head Quarters. went f'm thence by Invitation to General Lee's Quarters. din'd with him at Hobgobling Hall.³

Took Mrs C. at Cambridge. slept and H. at home.

30. *Thursday.* Went with M^m C. (my H: and ch.) to the Lines at Roxbury. with D. Storer M^r Payne Barrell &c. Mrs C. din'd. I at General Thomas' M^r Chases' [?] Invitation with the above Gentlemen. found they had innoculated at Boston small Pox. went p. m. with Mrs. C to Madam Foye's Milton. slept and H. there. called at Sister Gardiner's. Nabby at Home.

1. *Dece^r. Friday.* Came f'm Milton in Forenoon. We din'd at Mr Robert Pierpoints. called at Mr Dennies. slept and H: at home.

2. *Sat.* I made a Visit to M^r Payne's a. m. We all din'd at home. went p. m. on Foot to Watertown. slept and H at home.

3. *Lord's day.* Exchang'd with Mr Cushing. I baptiz'd at Waltham Twins and another Infant. Nabby and I din'd at M^r Payne's; with D. Storer, Barrell and Lady &c. Mrs Cooper confin'd at home: slept and H. there.

4. Went with Nabby (my H and ch) to Watertown. she din'd at Mrs Cochran's: I at M^r Hunt's opposite Davis Tavern.

I attended Corporation Meeting at Coolidge's. slept and H. home.

5. *Tuesday.* Attended (my H: and ch) Corporation and Overseer's Meeting at Watertown. din'd with former at Coolidges. Corporation sat at D^r Appleton's Lodgings Watertown. Overseer's adjourn'd to last Tuesday in Feby. next.

¹ See Washington's *Writings*, ed. Sparks, III. 115, 116, 502 *et seq.*

² Samuel Moody (H. C. 1746), Master of Dummer School.

³ General Lee's quarters in the Royall house at Medford, "whose echoing corridors suggested to his fancy the name of Hobgoblin Hall."

6. *Wednesday.* Went with M^{rs} C. (my H and ch) to Cambridg. Went to head Quarters Cambridg. [saw] General Gates. Call'd at Col Mifflins. saw D^r Morgan's Lady there. view'd the fine Mortar¹ (lately taken) on Cambridg Common. Din'd at Mr Hastings Stuart; M^{rs} C. after having gone to little Cambridg call'd for me, we came to Watertown. I attended and pray'd there at M^{rs} Sangar's Funeral. We went to M^r Payne's. Drank Coffee there with Deacon Smith and Lady. D. Storer M^r Barrell etc. return'd home about 3^o Clock. slept and H. there Nabby drank Coffee at M^{rs} Durant's. This day received a Billet directed to me from Boston inclosing a Sheet of Paper half printed the other Manuscript, being an Acc't of the Play to be acted at the Opening the Boston Theatre.² General Washington and several General Officers of our Army receiv'd a similar one. This is the Form of an Invitation to attend. It came out by the Lines at Roxbury with a Flag of Truce.

7. *Thursday.* Went with M^{rs} C (my H: and ch) to Deacon Storer's and Mr Barrells Lodgings at M^r Harringtons 3 Miles. Din'd with them agreeably to their kind Invitation last Evg. saw M^r Black from Boston: who gave us an Acc't of the State of Things there, and that they had innoculated not f'm Necessity, for only one or two had Small Pox, but as a Battery agst our Army and the Country. slept and H: at home Call'd at M^{rs} Turell's as we return'd.

8. Went with Mrs C. and Nabby my H. and ch. to M^{rs} Turell's, 2 Miles Din'd there agreeably to her kind Invitation last Evg. Mrs. Newell, Payne, Cushing &c. drank Coffee with us there. slept and H: at home.

9. *Saturday.* Went alone (my H: and Ch.) to Watertown a. m. We all din'd at home, and M^r James Dennie with us. slept and H. at home. This Day receiv'd f'm Parish at Watertown 1000 or 1200^{**} of Hay. Call'd upon Mrs. Newman p. m. at the Mellicot's.³

10. *Lords' day.* Went with M^{rs} C. and Nabby my H: and ch. to Watertown. we all din'd at Deacon Fisk's. I pch'd there all day. visited after Meeting p. m. M^r Fatherly f'm Boston sick. we all return'd home slept and H. there.

11. *Monday.* We all din'd at home. Went p. m. (my H: and ch.) with M^{rs} C. to Sister Cooper's at Deacon Livermore's. 2. Miles. drank Coffee there. slept and H at home.

12. *Tuesday.* rode alone (my H: and ch) to Watertown. Din'd at M^r Hall's Invitation at his House with Speaker Warren, Mr. Lover &c. returned home in Evg. visited by Mr Blanchard and Jonathan Pollard receiv'd a Letter f'm M^r Johonnot informing me little Sammy was bro't by him to his Lodgings at Medford. slept and H: at home.

13. *Wednesday.* Went (my H: and ch.) with M^{rs} C. and Nabby to Watertown. They proceeded to Medford and din'd with Mrs Johonnot at M^r Brook's. bro't Sammy home with them. Col Johonnot marching with Marblehead Regiment to relieve that Place said

¹ See Diary of Ezekiel Price, *l. c.*, p. 217, Frothingham, *l. c.*, p. 270.

² See *Mem. Hist. Boston*, III. 161; Timothy Newell's Journal, *l. c.*, p. 271.

³ Perhaps Milliquet.

to be attack'd by several Ships of War. I visited M^r Fatherly again. Din'd at M^r John Hunt's, at their Invitation with Col Orne, Palmer, M^r Gerry¹ etc. walk'd home. slept. Sammy with us, and H. at home.

14. *Thursday.* Went with M^r C. (my H and ch) to Watertown. She proceeded to old and little Cambridg to buy Things for Sammy. I din'd at M^r Cockran's on a Pig, with M^r Faneuil and Lady, and Dr Spring.² Nabby and Sammy din'd at home. I walk'd home in Evg. M^r C. return'd in chaise. M^r Blanchard and Pollard call'd in the Evg. slept: and H. at home. M^r Cooke presented me a Bottle of Snuff.

15. *Friday.* M^r C. went (my H: and ch) to Weston. din'd at Mr Savages. Nabby took an early Dinner and proceeded with Mr Blanchard in his chaise on a Visit to his Lady and Friends at Braintree. I din'd with Sammy at home. slept and H. at home.

16. M^r C. carried little Sammy after Breakfast to Medford. M^r Johonnots Lodgings. she din'd—return'd in Evg. I din'd at home: Went before dinner with M^r Turell to Watertown and return'd with her. Slept and H, at home. Nabby at Braintree.

17. *Lord's day.* Went with M^r C. my H: and ch. to Watertown. pch'd there all day. we both din'd at Deacon Fisk's. baptiz'd Joseph —of—Warren of little Cambridg. pray'd after Service p. m. at Funeral of M^r Spring's Child.

18. *Monday.* I walk'd out to Neighbor Hastings and Cuttings we din'd, slept and H at home. Nabby at Braintree.

19. *Tuesday.* Went with Mrs C. (my Horse and chaise) to Cambridg. we waited on General Washington, his Lady Mrs Gates &c. At Head Quarters. Treated with Oranges and a Glass of Wine. invited to dine with them, but excus'd ourselves. Went half past one for little Cambridg. Din'd at Mr Dennie's. return'd home in the Evening. slept and H. at home. Nabby still absent. This Day Capt Brown sent me two Hundred W^t. of Hay.

20. *Wednesday.* We din'd at home. I went (my H: and ch.) to Watertown. slept and H: at home Nabby still absent.

21. *Thursday.* very cold. We din'd at home. M^r Storer call'd upon us p. m. told us of a Vessel f'm England. bro't me a Letter f'm Js. Smith Jun^r. slept and H. at home. Froze Urine as well as Water in our Chambers. Nabby still absent.

22. *Friday.* Mrs C. went (my H: and ch) to M^r Fratingham to get the Chaise mended. did not dine at home. I did. she left the Chaise at his Shop: where she went twice. 8. Miles in all. slept and H. at home Nabby absent. very cold.

23. Still very cold. We din'd at home. I went, p. m. with M^r Clark to Watertown in his H: and ch. went to the Treasurer and Committee of Gen^l Court to hasten his Pay for Wood, that he might proceed on a journey to N. York, return'd home. slept and H. at home. Nabby still abroad.

¹ Elbridge Gerry, the statesman and signer.

² Dr. Marshall Spring (H. C. 1762), a man distinguished in his profession and a Tory. In later years he was a member of the Council of Massachusetts.

24. *Lord's day.* Great Storm of Snow. Went with M^{rs} C. (my Horse and ch) to Watertown. pch'd all Day. return'd. slept and H. at home.

25. *Monday.* Went with M^r Clark his Horse and chaise to Watertown and Cambridg. I dind at Col Johonnot's Quarters. M^{rs} Cooper at home. slept and H. at home. Nabby still absent.

Tuesday. 26. M^{rs} C. went my H: and Fratingham's Chaise to bring home my chaise. We din'd at home. I walk'd p. m. two Miles. cold. slept and H. at home.

Wednesday. 27. I walk'd to Watertown. din'd at M^r Bemus' M^{rs} Cooper at home. Katy went my Horse and chaise to Braintree for Abby. Miss Polly Johnston din'd with M^{rs} Cooper at home. I walk'd home. slept there. H. at Braintree.

Thursday. 28. I Walked to Watertown. din'd with M^r John Adams at M^r Hunt's Senior. M^{rs} Cooper at home. Katy return'd without Abby, Madame Apthorpe kindly urging her to stay at Braintree. I walk'd home. slept and H: there.

Friday. 29. We din'd at home. I went (with my H: and ch.) with M^r Clarke to Watertown. Col. Warren at my Desire chang'd his Money of this Province for Continental Bills. I paid Fratingham for mending chaise 8/. Lawf. M. paid Patten in full. paid Gardiner for Shaft of chaise. 5/. Townsend for mending my Silver Watch and for Seal and Key 12/6. slept and H: at home.

Saturday. 30th. We din'd at home. Sister Cooper spent Afternoon and drank Coffee with us. I went p. m. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. Slept and H at home. Nabby still absent.

Lord's day. Decr. 31. Rainy and raw Weather. Went with M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. pch'd all day upon barren Fig Tree. adapted last Day in Year. Din'd at D. Fisk's. return'd in the Evg. Slept and H. at home.

Monday. 1. Jany. 1776. We din'd at home. Mr Storer, Barrell, call'd upon me with Capt Martin lately f'm London and Boston. M^r Foster of Marblehead call'd a. m. I went my H: and ch. p. m. to Watertown. my Horse shod and cork'd by M^r Lath. paid him in Full four Pistareens.¹ call'd upon M^r White and Family. Gave to M^r W^m Newman 72.15.9 Lawf. Money, to purchase Goods at N. York for which He gave a Memorandum. slept and H. at home.

Tuesday 2. M^r Clark and Newman sat out for N. York 10th Clock. Mr Leonard Chaplain to Connecticut Forces call'd upon me. Went with M^{rs} C. (my H: and ch.) to little Cambridg. Din'd M^r Dennies. return'd p. m. M^r Ned Green call'd upon us with Mr Balch lately from London. read King's Speech to Parliament. slept and H. at home.

Wednesday 3. Jany. Paid M^r Kory in full viz. for Meal Potatoes and 1st Sawsages, 21/6. Paid his Sons John and Enoch in full to this day for taking Care of my Horse at 18 \mathcal{L} O. Ten' pr Year, for two Months

¹ Pistareen, at that time equal to about 19.3 of our cents.

and one Week 4. 17. 6. M^r Ned Green sent a written Invitation to us to Dine with Him to day in Company Mr Balch. Excus'd ourselves f'm dining. spent afternoon there, and till 8 "Clock Evg. with M^r Balch, Paynes Family, Storer Barrell &c slept and H at home.

Thursday, 4th Went (my H: and ch.) to Watertown, after dining at home. slept and H. at home.

Friday, 5th Jan^o. We din'd at home. Visited according to our Invitation p. m. By M^r Payne and Lady, M^r Barrell and his, M^r Cushing and his, M^r Ned Green and his, M^r Storer and Balch, M^m Newell, M^m Turell, who drank Coffee and spent fore part of the Evg. with us. M^r Bowen call in and spent an Hour or two. At Candle light Nabby came home with M^r Jack Wheelwright, after having been absent with Braintree Friends just 3. Weeks. soon after M^r Blanchard and Lady arriv'd. M^m Blanchard supp'd and slept with us. The Gentlemen went off before Supper.

Saturday 6th M^r Blanchard and Wheelwright breakfasted with us. They went off 10 "Clock. After a week of very mild Weather very cold and windy from N. West. Nabby and M^m Blanchard went (my H: Ch.) to visit Deacon Jeffries Family 2 Miles. M^m Blanchard din'd with us. I went (my H: and ch.) p. m. to Watertown. Slept and Horse at home. M^m Blanchard with us.

Lord's day. 7th. Jan^o. I went alone (my H: and ch) to Watertown. pch'd all day and administer'd Lord's Supper. M^m Cooper, Nabby, and M^m Blanchard din'd at home. Slept and Horse there.

Monday. 8th. M^m Cooper went (my H: and ch) to Roxbury. Nabby and M^m Blanchard din'd at M^m Cockran's. I rode M^r Kory's Horse to Deacon Fisk's and din'd there. We all slept and Horse at home.

Tuesday 9th. Tuesday I din'd at M^r Payne's with M^r Shrimpton Hutchinson, Deacon Storer, Barrell &c. M^m Cooper, Nabby and M^m Blanchard din'd at home. Slept and Horse there. M^r Blanchard sup't with us.

Wednesday. M^m Cooper and I at home all day. Nabby and M^m Blanchard went (my H: and ch) to Watertown, and din'd at Squire Hunts. They return'd in Evg. Slept and Horse at home.

Thursday 11th Jan^o. M^r Blanchard breakfasted with us. He and M^m Blanchard left us at 10 "Clock. carried Nabby (my H: and ch) to Watertown; she din'd at M^r Hall's. I din'd with M^m Cooper at home. We went (my H and ch) to Mrs Turell's. drank Coffee there. M^r Cook Jun' with us. Spent Evg. with us. Married this Evg. — — Lush — — Katy Jackson. Fee, 1 Dollar Bill.

Friday. 12. Went (my H: and ch) with M^m Cooper to Deacon Jeffries. I pray'd with her sick. We all din'd at home. Went (my H and ch) With M^m Cooper to Watertown. drank Coffee Deacon Fisk's. slept and H: at home.

Sat. 13. Went with M^m C. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. We all din'd at home. M^m C. went (my H. and ch) p. m. to M^m Durants. I went afterwards in ditto to Watertown. We all drank Coffee and slept and H at home.

Sab: 14 Jany. Went (my H and Ch.) to Watertown. M^{rs} C. and Nabby with me. We din'd at D. Fisk's. Nabby at Mr. Hall's. I pch'd all day. We return'd. Katy went and bro't Nabby after She had drank Coffee M^r Hall's. We all supt slept and H. at home.

Monday. 15. dull rainy day. We all din'd at home. I went a. m. (my H and ch) to Watertown. M^r Cushing call'd upon us p. m. M^r J. Pollard drank Coffee with us. slept and H. at home.

Tuesday 16. Jan^r. Went (my H. and ch) with Mrs. C. to Watertown a. m. We all din'd at home. Went my H and ch. p. m. with Nabby to Watertown. Nabby drank Coffee at M^r Hall's. found at home M^r J. Wheelwright Who drank Coffee and slept with us. slept and H. at home.

Wednesday. 17. M^r J. Wheelwright breakfasted with us. I din'd at M^r Cushing's. went (my H: and ch) pch'd his Lecture. I drank Coffee M^r Paynes. M^r Storer, Barrell, Woodward and B^r Payson there. great Storm of Snow p. m. Nabby and M^{rs} Cooper at home. slept and H: at home.

Thursday 18th. Went Mrs. C. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. We all din'd at home. Nabby drank Coffee Mrs. Durants. I went (my H. and ch) p. m. to Watertown. Mrs. C. at home. slept and H. at home. Wrote to Cousin Scott.

Fryday 19. I went Mrs. C. my H: and Ch. to Watertown a. m. Nabby walk'd there. She din'd old Madam Hunts: drank Coffee there: and spent Evg. at Mrs. Cockran's. My Wife and I din'd at home. slept and H: at home.

Sat: 20. M^{rs} C. went my H: and ch to Watertown. She return'd with B^r Cooper who din'd with us. I went with B^r Cooper p. m. my H: ch. to Watertown. Katy went in it to Mr. Durant's afterwards. slept and H: at home. N. B. Shed paid this Day in full for Milk.

Sab. Jan^r. 21. Went (my H: Ch) with M^{rs} C. and Nabby Watertown. we all din'd with B^r and Sister Cooper D. Fisk's. I pch'd a. m. D^r Appleton kindly pch't for me p. m. We drank Coffee at D. Fisk's: Nabby with Miss Polly Johnston at Cap't. Craft's. I married Robert Hughs and Meriam Pearse. Fee, 1 Dollar Bill. slept and H. at home. M^r Clark arriv'd f'm New York.

Monday 22. M^{rs} C. and Nabby went (my H: and ch) to Watertown. Nabby din'd at M^{rs} Cockrants; We at home. M^{rs} C. and I p. m. (in my H: and Ch) to Daw's. pray'd with her. Nabby slept at M^{rs} Cockran's. We, and H: at home.

Tuesday 23. M^{rs} C. and I went (my H: and ch) to Brooklyne. din'd with D^r Chauncey and Lady at M^{rs} Hyslop's. Nabby at M^{rs} Cockran's. M^{rs} Cook came home with Nabby and spent the Evg. slept and H at home.

Wednesday 24. Went with M^{rs} C. my H: and ch to Watertown. I din'd with M^r Gerry, M^r Gordon¹ etc at Squire Hunt's. M^{rs} C. and

¹The Rev. William Gordon, D.D., minister of the Third Church in Roxbury, and chaplain to the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts. Dr. Cooper had declined to officiate as chaplain of the Congress on account of the state of his affairs. *Journals*, pp. 184, 187.

Nabby at home. M^r C. came with Chaise and bro't me home. Slept: and H: at home.

Thursday. Wrote to D^r Witherspoon,¹ and to M^r S. Adams² at Congress. Nabby went my H: and ch. to Menotomy with Hannah Cook and din'd at her Father's. I walk'd to Watertown din'd at M^m Hunt's. M^r C. at home. We all slept and Horse at home. Wrote this day to M^r Hooker N. Hampton. Newman came with my Goods. M^r Cook part of Evg.

Friday 26. We all din'd at home. Mrs C. went (my H and ch) p. m. to Brown's at little Cambridg. We all slept and H at home.

Sat. 27. M^r C. went (my H: and ch) to little Cambridge. She din'd. Nabby and I din'd at home. we all drank Coffee, slept, and H. at home.

Lord's day. 28th Jan^u. Went (my H and ch) with M^r C. and Nabby to Watertown. pch'd all day there. We din'd at D. Fisk's. Nabby at M^r Hall's: and drank Coffee there. slept and H. at home.

29th Monday. M^r C. and Nabby went my H: and ch. to Enoch Brown's, little Cambridg. They return'd a. m. Cap't Freeman and Wife came to visit us about 12 ^oClock and din'd with us. They gave us a fine Leg of Mutton. 2^{lb} Butter. 2^{lb} Coffee. They drank Coffee, supt and slept with us; their Horse kept with ours. We gave Butter, Mutton and Coffee to Miss Sally.

30. Went with Capt Freeman (my H: and ch) to Watertown. returned a. m. Our Friends din'd with us. They went p. m. with M^r Cooper (my H: and ch) to Watertown, old Madam Hunt's. They supt slept and Horse kept with us.

31. Wednesday. Our Friends Capt. Freeman and Wife breakfasted with us, and left us about 10 ^oClock. Mrs. C. and I went about the same Time (my H: and ch.) to Medford. I visited and pray'd with Miss Nanny Payne, sick at Mr Brook's. din'd at M^r Turell's. M^r Cooper went on Business towards the Bridge. She din'd, sold twenty silk Handkerchiefs. return'd by Watertown Meeting House. Nabby din'd at home; where we all Drank Coffee; slept and Horse.

1. Feby Thursday. M^r C. went (my H: and chaise) to Dorchester. on Business. She din'd. Nabby and I at home. D^r Langdon call'd upon me in the Evg. We all slept and H: at home.

2 Feby. Friday. Mrs. Cooper went after Breakfast (my H: and ch) to Milton. She din'd. drank Coffee at Sister Gardiner's slept at M^m Foyes. I walk'd to Watertown a. m. din'd at D. Fisk's. Nabby at home. Horse with M^r C. at M^m Foye's.

3. Saturday. Nabby and I din'd at home. M^r Cooper return'd to us in Evg. very cold. We all drank Coffee, supt and H at home.

4. Lord's day. Went with M^r C (my H: and ch) and with Nabby to Watertown. I pch'd there all day. read Proclamation f'm General

¹ The Rev. John Witherspoon, D.D., president of the college of New Jersey, and a delegate to the Continental Congress.

² See extract from a letter of Dr. Cooper of about this date, in *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.* 1875-76, p. 279.

Court for Reformation of Manners in afternoon Sermon ; adapted to that Occasion. made Mention of M^r Pitt's Death at Close. We all din'd at D. Fisk's. Nabby drank Coffee at M^r Hall's. Mr Cook return'd with her and supt with us. slept and H : at home.

5. Feby. Monday. M^r C. went (my H: and ch) to Roxbury. Nabby and I din'd at home. M^r Kendall who had been one of D^r Wheelock's¹ Missionaries din'd with me. Slept and H. at home.

6. Tuesday. Went with M^r C. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. I pray'd with Bemiss Sons sick. We all din'd at home. Mrs Dennie and Katy Bulfinch din'd with us. M^r Tommy Dennie came p. m. they all drank Coffee and supp'd with us. D^r Roberts spent an Hour with us in Evg. slept and H. at home. Capt Freeman sent us a Peck Beans. gave them to Miss Sally.

7. Wednesday. M^{rs} C went (my H : and ch) to Watertown a. m. we all din'd at home. Nabby went with me in the chaise p. m with me to Watertown. M^{rs} Cockran's. She drank Tea there. return'd with me at Sunset. slept. and H. at home.

8. *Thursday.* Light Snow. I went (my H: ch) to Watertown. didn't at Deacon Fisk's; with Mr. Thacher. pray'd at Funeral of Mr. Learned. visited Mrs. Daws. pray'd with her, and Bemiss Family. M^r C. and Nabby at home all day. slept and H. at home.

9. Friday. I went my H: and ch, a. m. to visit Sister Cooper unwell. We all din'd at home. I went (my H and ch) to Watertown p. m. slept and H. at home

10. Saturday. We all din'd at home. I went (my H and ch) to Watertown p. m. we all slept and H at home

Feby. 11th. Lord's day. Went with Nabby my H: and ch. to Watertown. We din'd at D. Fisk's. M^r C. at home. I pch'd all day. baptiz'd 1. Jonathan of —— return'd and drank Coffee, slept and H. at home.

12. Monday. Walk'd to Watertown a. m. We all din'd at home. I carried Nabby (my H: and ch) p. m. to Watertown. She spent Afternoon and Evg. at M^r Craft's. return'd in Evg. slept and H. at home. pray'd in Forenoon with Capt Brown's Daughter, and Bemiss Family.

13. *Tuesday.* Went with M^r C. to M^r Dennis. We din'd there. Nabby at home. M^r Washington, Gates, Mifflin call'd and finding us not at home left th'r names. M^r Scott breakfasted with us. bro't me a letter f'm M^r Scott and Nabby one f'm Sally Chardon. M^r Hyslop call'd p. m. Nabby and Sally spent p. m. at Sister Cooper's. M^r Buckminster call'd in Evg. with Ribbons &c f'm Capt Freeman. slept and H. at home

14. Wednesday. Mrs. C. went (my H. and ch) to Medford, about Sale of Ribbons. Nabby and I din'd at home. I visited p. m. on Foot M^r Payne. M^m C. return'd in the Evg. slept and H: at home. Capt Brown sent me 400⁰⁰ English Hay.

¹ The Rev. Eleazar Wheelock (Yale Coll., 1733), founder and first president of Dartmouth College.

15. *Thursday.* M^r C. went (my H: and ch) to Capt: Freeman's Framingham. She slept there. I din'd at M^r Hall's Watertown. went there with M^r Clark, in his chaise; return'd in Deacon Storer's with him and his Son. They spent half an Hour. M^r Wheelwright drank Coffee with us M^r Blanchard call'd afterwards: but did not stay the Evg.

16. *Friday.* M^r Wheelwright Blanchard and Coz Scott breakfasted with us. M^r Wh. and Nabby took an early Dinner at 12, and sat off for Braintree I din'd afterwards with M^r Clark. M^r Cooper return'd p. m. we visited Sister Cooper and M^r Mellicot: drank Coffee at both Places. slept and H. at home.

17. *Saturday.* We din'd at home. Nabby absent. slept and H. at home. I went p. m. to Watertown; to Rogers Clockmaker (in my H: and ch). paid him for mending warming pan.

18. *Lord's day.* very cold. Went with M^r C (my H and ch) to Watertown. din'd at D. Fisk's. I pch'd all day. baptiz'd *Lucy* of David Coolidge.

19. *Monday.* Went with M^r C. (my H. and ch) to little Cambridge by M^r Dennies Invitation; to dine with M^r Hooper. I din'd there, but he sent a Billet of Excuse. M^r C. went to Roxbury and din'd. We return'd in the Evg. Slept and H. at home. pray'd in my Way to M^r Dennies with Wyman's child.

20. *Tuesday.* Went with M^r C. (my H: and ch) to Newtown. we din'd at M^r Gibb's with D^r Chauncey and Lady. call'd in at M^r Hall's. drank Coffee slept and H. at home. Katy went on a Visit to Westown.

21. Went M^r C. (my H: and ch) to Cambridge. I din'd with M^r Leonard at Gen^r Putnam's Quarters. M^r C. din'd. we return'd to Watertown and attended Widow Freeman's Funeral. I pray'd. return'd slept and H at home.

22. *Thursday.* Went with M^r C. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. I pray'd with Capt. Brown's Family. we din'd at home. Capt Brown paid me for my Services as Minister in Watertown 20 \mathcal{L} Lawf. Money. visited p. m. M^r Payne's Family. Katy return'd f'm Weston. slept and H. at home.

23. *Fryday.* Went with M^r C. (my H: and ch) to Deacon Fisk's Watertown. I din'd there. M^r C. return'd and din'd at home. She came for me with chaise p. m. we visited M^r Storer. I borrow'd upon Note of Mr. Gill 15 \mathcal{L} . 18/. L. M. slept and H. at home.

24 *Feby. Sat.* M^r C. went my Horse and chaise to Milton for Nabby. M^r Foyes Servant went with a chaise, and brot Nabby to her Mother there. They din'd at M^r Foyes. Nabby return'd to M^r Apthorp's at Braintree, who would not part with her. M^r C. return'd in Evg. I din'd at home this Day. slept and H: at home.

25. *Lord's day.* Went with M^r C. to Watertown. I pch'd all day there. din'd at D. Fisk's. read Proclamation for Fast, on acc't of the War. return'd. slept. and H at home.

26. *Monday.* I went my H: and ch. to Watertown. I pray'd with Amos Bond's Wife sick, return'd and din'd at home. Went p. m.

with M^r C. (my H. and ch) to Sister Cooper's: at D. Livermore's and to M^r Payne's Family. M^r Payne kindly presented me with a new Wig made for himself worth 44/. L. M. slept and H: at home. we drank Coffee at M^r Payne's.

27. *Tuesday.* M^r C. went (my H. and ch) and M^r Kory attended her with his Cart to Roxbury to bring home our Trunks left at M^r William's. it rain'd all day. I went in M^r Cockran's chaise to Capt Brown's. pray'd with his Daughter sick. to M^r Cockran's pray'd there her little Son sick. attended Overseer's Meeting at Council Board. din'd with President, M^r Murray Boothbay &c at M^r Fowle's. return'd home. Mrs C. and M^r Kory came in Evg home with the Trunks. slept and H. at home.

28. *Wednesday.* Went (my H. and ch) to Watertown. din'd at home. went (my H: and ch) p. m to M^r Turell's. Drank Coffee there. paid Wellman for shoeing my Horse 7 /. O. Ten. M^r Bradshaw gave me dressing my Hat 7 /. O. Ten¹ Snowy Weather. M^r Sam¹ Eliot spent Evg with us. slept and Horse at home.

29. *Feb^r.* M^r C. went (my H: and ch) to Watertown. Patten mended Saddle. We din'd at home. Went p. m. (my H. and ch) to Watertown. I pray'd with M^r Cockran's Son, Amos Bond's Wife, Jonas White. Drank Coffee at Mrs Cockran's. Slept and H at home. D. Storer with his Son and Daught'r. visited us.

March 1. Fryday. We din'd at home. Master Tho^r Thatcher visited us p. m. I went (my H: and ch) to M^r Paynes. slept and H: at home.

2. *Sat:* Went with M^r C. my H: and Ch. to Watertown. We din'd at home. Went p. m. (my H. and Ch) to Sam¹ Whites Son's Funeral. return'd by Deacon Fisk's. Boston Cannonaded and bombarded from our Lines for the first Time this Night. Two of our Mortars split.

3. *Lord's day.* Went my H: and ch. to Watertown. din'd at D. Fisk's. M^r C. came in my chaise sent back for her after Dinner. pch'd all day and administer'd. no Firing f'm our Lines to day: but begun about 1 ^oClock at Night. continued till Morn^g. The fine brass Mortar call'd the Congress crack'd.¹

4. An Alarm that the King's Forces were coming f'm Boston to Cambridg, but groundless. Sent off Nabby's Trunks to M^r Miliquets. Went there with M^r C. my H. and ch. f'm thence to Watertown. we din'd at home. went p. m. to Watertown. call'd at M^r Storer's. This and all the near Towns round us call'd into the Lines. Preparations making by our Army to take Possession of Dorchester Heights and Point. M^r Kory and Son and M^r Clarke all gone to the Army. last took Possession—Dorchester Hill.¹

¹ Cf. Diary of Ezekiel Price, I. c., p. 240.

² See Washington to the President of Congress, March 7, ed. Sparks, III. 302; Letters of Ebenezer Huntington, in AM. HIST. REV., V. 708, 709; Robert Pierpont to James Bowdoin, March 5, in *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, sixth series, IX. 393, 394; Timothy Newell's Journal, *ibid.*, fourth series, I. 272; General Gates to John Adams, March 8, in *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 1875-76, p. 281; Diary of Ezekiel Price, *ibid.*, 1863-64, p. 240; Diary of John Rowe, *ibid.*, second series, X. 94, 95; Diary of John Tudor, pp. 60, 61.

5. *Tuesday.* Went with M^r C. (my H: and ch) to Watertown. M^r Thatcher¹ pronounc'd Oration—for horrid Massacre. I pray'd on that Occasion in Meeting House. din'd with Inhabitants of Boston at M^r Coolidge's Tavern. M^r C. din'd at M^r Dennie's. we return'd home in Evg. slept and H. at home.

6. *Wednesday.* Very high Wind and Rain at South last Night continu'd windy all day. General Howe's Troops went yesterday f'm Boston to the Castle intending an attack on our Troops at 5 ^oClock this Morn². prevented by the Wind. I went to Watertown, (my H: and ch) to attend Corporation Meeting at D^r Appleton's Lodgings. could not reach there with D^r Winthrop in my Chaise on Acc't of bad Roads. return'd and din'd at home. slept and H. there.

7. *March. Thursday.* Fast appointed by Gen^l Court thro the Colony. I pch'd all day at Watertown. M^r C. went with me (my H: and Ch) she went after Service p. m. to Mrs. Cockran's and drank Coffee there. I went with D. Fisk (my H: and Ch) to M^r Bright's Funeral. pray'd there. return'd slept and H: at home.

8. *Friday.* Went to have my Chaise mended at Whitney's Watertown. din'd at home. Went (my H: and ch) p. m. with Mrs. C. to Watertown. pray'd at Widow Sanger's Child's Funeral. slept and H. at home. heard by a Cap't of Vessel who escap'd f'm Boston last Night, that the Troops there were preparing to embark and leave the Place. Letter f'm Selectmen³ remaining in Boston to Gen^l Wash —about cannonading the Town &c. slept and H. at home

9. *Sat.* Went a. m. with M^r C. (my H: and Ch) to Watertown. we din'd at home. went (my H: and ch) p. m. to visit M^r Hammond sick. He had just expir'd. I pray'd with the Family. on Return we call'd at Sister Cooper's and M^r Payne's. slept and H: at home.

10. *Lord's day.* Went with M^r C. my H: and Ch. to Watertown. we din'd at D. Fisk's. I pch'd all day there. went after Service p. m M^r Dennies. inform'd of the great Cannonading last Night to and from Boston. a Surgeon and 3 Privates kill'd at Dorchester Hill, by one Cannon Ball f'm Boston. slept and H at M^r D^r. No Thundring f'm Cannon to Night.

11th *March. Mond.* Went with M^r Tho^r Dennie (his H: and ch) to Cambridge. waited on Gen^l Washington and Lady, Gates &c. convers'd with the Gen^l and Gates about the Manner of our taking Possession of Boston s'd the Enemy leave it. more Accts of the Preparation of the Enemy to depart. Preparations on our Side for Troops to march towards N. York, as the Enemy expected to go tht way. Return'd with M^r Th. D. to Jackson's Tavern: din'd there, according to Invitation 3. Days ago, with Selectmen of Cambridge. open'd about 3 ^oClock their Annual Town Meeting with Pray'r. M^r Cooper din'd at M^r Dennies. return'd with her. drank Coffee slept and H. at home.

¹ Peter Thacher, D.D. (H. C. 1769), minister of Malden. In 1785 he succeeded Dr. Cooper as pastor of Brattle Street Church.

² See Sparks, Washington's *Writings*, III. 531-532; Timothy Newell's Journal, c., pp. 292, 293.

12. Tues. We din'd at home. went with B^r Cooper his H. and ch. p. m. to Watertown. M^r C. (my H: and ch) to Mrs Turell's. drank Coffee there. Slept and H: at home.

13. Wedn. Went (my H: and ch) to Wellmans. My Horse fore Shoes sat. paid him. On Return home found Nabby from Braintree with M^r Blanchard: after being absent 3. Weeks and 5 days. B^r Lathrop f'm Providence din'd with us. went p. m. (my H. and ch) to Watertown. paid Whitney 10/. O. Ten^r for mending Harness. slept and H. at home. Receiv'd late M^r Hunts Sermons by his Brother with Letter f'm B^r Hooker.

14. Thursday. We din'd at home. I went p. m. my H. and ch to Watertown. slept and H: at home. no Cannonading for Several Nights. further Accts of British Troops preparing to leave Boston.

15. I went to Watertown a. m. (my H: and ch) Col. Johonnot return'd and din'd with us, on a Haddock. purchas'd by me. Hay f'm Hagar this morn^r. W^r paid M^r Korey this Evg. for keeping my Horse this Week past, 30/. O. Ten^r and for Meal ditto. slept and H. at home.

16. Sat. M^r Sergeant f'm Stock-bridge visited me a. m. D.^r Witherspoon's eldest Son (with M^r Pidgeon Jun^r) bro't me a Letter f'm his Father. We din'd at home without any Company. I went p. m. to Watertown (my H: and ch). M^r Korey bro't me a Letter f'm Post Office Cambridge, paid him 10/. O. Ten^r Postage.

17. March. Lord's day. Went with Nabby (my H: and ch) to Watertown. M^r C. at home unwell. pch'd there all day. We din'd at D. Fisk's. saw D. Newell after Service p. m. at M^r Hall's Watertown. He gave us an Acc't f'm Boston that the British Army had left it, ¹ of the great Plunder on the House Furniture and Goods of the Inhabitants; and of my own in particular. slept and Horse at home.

18. Monday. Carried Nabby (my H: and ch) to Watertown M^r Cockran's. She din'd there. return'd and went with M^r C. to Fratingham's for mending Chaise. He not at home. went to D. Fisk's. I din'd there, M^r C. ate no Dinner, unwell. Return'd home took Nabby with us slept and H: at home.

19. Tuesday. Nabby and M^r C. went (my H: and ch) to Boston. Carried to D^r Bulfinch q^r Veal, 2^{lb} Butter 2 Doz Eggs, to Glasgow Gallon of Milk and some Indian Meal. They saw D^r B. Children, He and his Wife having gone to Braintree. They visited our House, found it robb'd of a great Part of my Furniture. They return'd home. I walk'd to M^r Payne's a. m. and to Watertown p. m. slept and H. at home.

20. Wed. Mrs C. went alone (my H: and ch) to Boston saw D. B. and Wife, visited Friends and our House. Bro't me a Pint Bottle red Lavendar and 2 Bottles of English Ale f'm Molly and Betty Minot. M^r Scott and Serv't Dick din'd with me at M^r Clark's. went p. m. with M^r Scott to Watertown in his Chaise. walk'd home. slept and H. at home.

¹ Diary of John Tudor, p. 62.

21. *Thursday.* M^r C. went (my H : and ch), with Nabby to Watertown. Nabby din'd at M^r Hall's. M^r C. went to Cambridg. return'd and din'd at home. visited p. m. by Deacon Tainter, M^r Payne and Ned Green. I went in my Chaise p. m. to Watertown. wrote Letters this Morn^g by M^r Hyde Carrier to D^r Franklin, Col Hancock, M^r Hancock. slept and H : at home

22. *Fryday.* M^r C. went my H : and ch to Watertown to Billings Tailor about my Cloaths. return'd a. m. Mr. Gannet call'd and din'd with us. I went p. m. my H : and ch to Watertown. slept and H : at home.

23. *Sat : March.* I went a. m (my H. and ch) to Watertown. M^r C. went p. m. (my H : and ch) to Weston M^r Savage's. Bro't our Plate &c. Slept and H : at home ; we din'd at home.

24. *Lord's day.* Went my H : and ch. with M^r C. and Nabby to Watertown. we din'd at D. Fisk's, Nabby at M^r Cockran's. I pch'd there all day. we return'd home, and sent the chaise back for Nabby who drank Tea at M^r Halls. slept and Horse at home.

25. *Monday.* M^r C. took Nabby in my (H : and ch) to Boston. John Korey carried Katy on the black mare to the same Place. I din'd at home. walk'd p. m. to Mr Payne's. found Mrs Cooper at home on my Return in the Evg. She left Nabby and Katy at home getting our House into Order. They slept at the MSS. Minots.

26. *Tuesday.* Went with M^r C. my (H : and ch) to Boston. a melancholy Scene. Many Houses pull'd down by the British Soldiery. the Shops all shut. Marks of Rapine and Plunder evr'y where. we din'd at D^r Bulfinch's with Nabby, Cap't Freeman, M^r Barrell. visited p. m. my House. found all my Beds Bedsteds, Sheets Blankets Quilts and Coverlids, all my China Glass and Crockery Ware, &c &c, plunder'd, 2 Lookin Glasses gone 2 broke, 1 Dressing Glass gone &c. Mrs C. and I supt and slept at D^r Bulfinch's. Nabby and Katy at MSS. Minots. my Horse kept there

27. *Wednesday.* Went with M^r C. to our House. procur'd an Order f'm General Green to take Furniture f'm deserted Houses, agreeably to the Leave granted me yesterday on my Petition to Gen^l. Court,¹ to supply my desolated empty House with Furniture f'm Dwellings left by the Enemies to our Country. remov'd some Things from Paxton's² and Richard Smith's³ House by Aid of M^r J. Pollard who saw all that was taken. I din'd at D. Storer's, M^r C. at her Brother's, Nabby at Minots. bo't a Q^r Pork, 52/. M^r C. and I slept at D^r Bulfinch's. Nabby and Katy at Minots. Horse there.

28. *Thursday.* All our Family went to Thursday Lect : open'd by D^r Eliot. General Washington and all the General Officers present.

¹ *Resolves, Mass.*, III. 30; Force's *Archives*, fourth series, V. 1265.

² Charles Paxton, commissioner of the customs in Boston. He was proscribed, banished, and his estate confiscated.

³ Richard Smith was a protester against the Solemn League and Covenant and an addresser of Hutchinson in 1774.

Din'd with them and a great Number of Gentlemen at Bunch of Grapes Tavern. Dinner prepar'd by Committee of General Court. Walk'd with the Generals &c. after Dinner to Fort Hill. Cap't Erving¹ gave me Liberty to take some Furniture f'm M^r Moffatt's House; M^r Newman helped me in the Removal. M^m C. and I slept at D^r Bulfinch's. Nabby din'd at M^m Pollard's, M^m C at her Brother's. Nabby and Katy slep't at Miss Minots. Horse there.

29. *Friday.* Still employ'd in removing Things to my House. din'd with Gen^l Green at Mr. Bromfield's. M^m C. at home. Nabby at Miss Pollard's. M^r W^m Newman aided in removing. M^m C. and I slept at D^r B'. Nabby and Katy at Miss Minots. Horse there.

30. *Saturday.* My Family employ'd in preparing Things in our House. They all din'd there. I at Miss Minot's. Nabby and Katy slept at home. M^m C. and I came our H: and a chaise procur'd for me by D. Bulfinch to Waltham. we slept and H: at M^r Clark's there.

31. *Lord's day.* M^m C. and I went (my H: and ch) to Watertown I pch'd there all day. pray'd at Funeral of M^m Storer's only child, a young Man of 20 Years. We din'd at D. Fiske's. slept and H. at M^r Clark's.

April 1. *Monday.* Went with M^m C. my H: and ch. to Boston. p. m. chaise broke by Major Thompson's Brooklyne. borrow'd his. left mine at Child's Blacksmith. slept with Mrs. C. at Miss Minots. Horse at Cap't Ervings.

2. I din'd at D. Newell's. M^m C. at our House. slept with M^m C. at Miss Minot's. Horse at D. Storer's.

3. Went with M^m C. to Watertown. Corporation and Overseer's Meeting there. Din'd at Mrs. Coolidges with College Gentlemen. went p. m. to Waltham with M^m C. who din'd at D. Fisk's. slept at M^r Clark's. Horse there on my Hay.

4. *Thursday.* We din'd at home; Sign'd Diploma for Gen^l Washington's Doctorate of Laws.² went to Cambridge p. m. to wait on him and take Leave; found him set out for Boston, and f'm thence to N. York. slept and H. at M^r Clark's, on his Hay.

5. *Friday.* M^m C. went alone my H: and ch to Boston. She din'd at our House. I walk'd to Watertown din'd at Mr Hall's. walk'd back to M^r Clark's where M^m C. return'd. slept and H: there on M^r Clark's Hay.

6. *Saturday.* Went with M^m C. my Horse and ch to Boston. I din'd at D. Storer's. slept with M^m C. and my Family for the first Time in my own House Horse at D. Storer's.

¹ John Erving sat in the Council of Massachusetts for many years prior to the Revolution. He was born in 1690, at Kirkwall, in the Orkneys, and died in Boston in 1786, aged 96. At the time of his death he was probably the richest merchant in New England. His eldest son, John Erving, Jr., was a Mandamus Councillor and Loyalist refugee. One daughter married Governor Bowdoin; another, Governor Scott, of Dominica; yet another, Duncan Stewart, Collector at New London before the Revolution.

² The degree of LL.D. had not been previously conferred by Harvard College, except in the case of Professor John Winthrop, F.R.S., a graduate of the class of 1732, upon whom it was bestowed three years earlier.

7. *Lord's day.* Pch'd all day at O. Brick; (D' Chauncy unwell and not come to Town) to a large Assembly especially p. m. when I deliver'd Occasional Sermon. have not pch'd in Boston before since 10th of last April. slept at home; Horse at M' Storer's.

8. *Monday.* M^r C. Nabby and I invited to dine at Capt Erving's and M' Storer's. They excus'd themselves. I din'd at Cap't Erving's: Pray'd p. m. in King's Chappel over D' Warren's Corpse, bro't f'm Charlestown by free Masons to be reintern'd, a vast Concource.¹ M^r Morton² deliver'd Funeral Eulogium. slept at home. Horse at D. Storer's.

9. *Tuesday.* We all din'd at home. Slept Horse for first Time at Mrs Turell's. D. Smith bro't me 25 \mathcal{L} O. Ten^r Sabbath's Contrib.

10. I din'd at D' Bulfinch's with Parson Parker M^r Timmin's &c. M^r [C.] Carried Nabby, my H: and ch to Watertown. she slept at M^r Hall's. M^r Cooper return'd. we slept at home. H. at M^r Turell's.

11. We din'd at home. Nabby still at M^r Halls. Horse at M^r Turell's.

12. *Friday.* We din'd at home. H: at M^r T.

13 *April. Saturday.* I went my H: ch. to bring Nabby f'm Watertown. we din'd at Mr. Hall's. came home p. m. slept at home. H. at M^r T.

14. *Lord's day.* pch'd all day at O. Brick. D' Chauncy not come to Town. Large Assemblies.

15. *Monday.* Din'd at home. Deacon Newell bro't me yesterday's Contribution—18 \mathcal{L} O. Ten^r. Slept at home. H. at Mr Turell's.

16. Rainy. din'd at home. Slept. Horse at M^r T.

17. *Wednesday.* Went with M^r C. (my H: and ch) to Waltham; din'd in our Way at M^r Dennie's little Cambridg. slept at Mr. Clark's. Horse on my own Hay there.

18. *Thursday.* Left Mr Clark's after Breakfast. din'd at Deacon Fisk's. came home. Sally Chardon drank Tea with us. H. at M^r Turells

19. Din'd at home. slept and H. at M^r T.

20. Din'd with M^r Boyer at old Mr Johonnot's. M at M^r T.

21. *Lord's day.* Exchang'd Mr Lothrop (D' Pemberton's House)³ a. m. pch'd at O Brick p. m. Sally Chardon din'd and slept with us. Deacon Jeffries and M^r W^m Newman supp'd with us. H. at Mr T.

22. *Monday.* Deacon Newell bro't yesterday's Contribution. 18 \mathcal{L} O. T. Sally Chardon din'd and slept with us. H. at M^r T.

23. *Tuesday.* Went with Mrs C. a. m. to Watertown Corporation and Overseer's Meeting. I din'd with Corporation at Learned's Tavern. Instructors of College gave in a written Declaration to the

¹ See Diary of John Rowe, *l. c.*, p. 99.

² Perez Morton, from 1810 to 1832 attorney-general of Massachusetts.

³ The Old North Meeting house (the church of the Mathers), over which the Rev. John Lathrop was settled, had been "pulled down by order of Genl Howe for fuel for the Refugees and Tories".—Journal of Timothy Newell, *l. c.*, p. 271.

Overseers of their political Principles. slept at M' Clark's. Horse on his Hay.

24. Wednesday. Went (my H: and ch) with M' C to Framingham. Din'd at Cap't Freeman's slept and H: there.

25. Din'd at Capt Freeman's: Drank Coffee at Mr Habij^h Savages. slept at Capt. Freeman's H: there. Sally Chardon left our House.

26. Left Capt Freemans after Breakfast. I din'd at Watertown Mr Bemis's. M^m C. We call'd at Mr. Dennies. slept at home. H: at Mr T.

27. M^m Cooper taken ill of a Fever p. m.

Lord's day. Apr. 28. Dr Chauncey pch'd, a. m. 1 p. m. D. Newell bro't my part of Contribution. 13; 19; 3. O Ten^t.

Friday 4th [3] May. Dr Chauncy pch'd Friday Lecture M^m C. dangerously ill.

Lord's day. 6 [5] May. Dr. Chauncy pch'd and administer'd. I pch'd p. m. M^m C. very ill.

Monday. D. Newell bro't my part of Contribution. 8—18—1. O. Ten^t

Lord's day. 13th [1st] Dr Chauncy pch'd a. m. 1 p. m.

Monday. 14. [13]. D. Williams bro't my half of Contribution—7—5—2. O Ten^t.

Friday, 17 May. Continental Fast.¹ Dr Chauncy a. m. 1 p. m. gave Notice in publick that divine Service w'd be perform'd by divine Leave in our Meeting-house ² next Lord's day.

2. Letter of John Quincy Adams, 1811.

FOR the following document we are indebted to Dr. James Westfall Thompson, of the University of Chicago. It is a dispatch sent by John Quincy Adams to the Department of State during the time when he was Minister in Russia. The manuscript, which is in the possession of Mr. Frederick M. Steele of Chicago, was secured in London. It is believed to have been intercepted by a British cruiser claiming to exercise the right of search. The portions comprised in brackets were written in cipher, and have been translated for Doctor Thompson by a clerk in the Department of State. The translation had to be made out, syllable by syllable, from old letters, on file among the early records, in which the same cipher is used; for the Department does not possess a copy of the cipher code then employed. For the subject-matter, see *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, Vol. II., *passim*.

¹*Journals*, 1776, p. 93; *Diary of John Tudor*, p. 63.

²During the siege, Brattle Street Church had been used by the British "for a barracks".

ADAMS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

N. 70.

ST. PETERSBURG, 3. October 1811.

The Secretary of State
of the United States*Sir :*

I have furnished the French Ambassador, as he requested, with a list of the American vessels which have arrived this year at Cronstadt, and have sailed again for the United States. I have also sent a copy of the same list to Mr. Russell at Paris, by a courier despatched last Monday by Count Lauriston ; and have mentioned to Mr. Russell in a letter the motive upon which it was requested—to obtain a more speedy liberation of any of them which might be captured by the French privateers said to be stationed at the passage of the Sound. When the Courier was despatched I had already heard that Mr. Barlow had sailed from Annapolis for France, and I learn this morning that he arrived the 6th of last month at Cherbourg. Having understood from Mr. Russell that it was his intention to leave Paris immediately after the Minister should arrive, I have requested that Mr. Barlow would in that case open the letter, addressed to Mr. Russell. I hope there will be no capture of any of the vessels, to make the interposition of either of those gentlemen, with the French Government, necessary to obtain their release. But if there should, I shall be happy to find the good intentions of the Ambassador in asking for the list realized, by its contributing to their immediate liberation. I am not inclined to suspect any unfriendly intention towards us, as having contributed in the slightest degree to this request. There is a frankness and good humor in the character of the Ambassador, in which deep dissimulation is not congenial. He has often very freely and explicitly avowed to me his wish for a war between the United States and England. Having in my own nature as little dissimulation, as I think observable in his, I have never pretended in this respect to coincide with him in sentiment ; [but I have more than once suggested to him that if his Government really wished that war should be the result of English ill-usage towards the United States, it was a strange way of manifesting that desire to rivalize with England in acts of the like ill-usage, and I have not scrupled to avow to him that so long as France should continue to hold towards us such a course of conduct, it was my opinion that neither the people nor the Government of the United States would engage themselves in a war which would be so conformable to her views and policy.] He has assured me in strong terms of *his own* wish that his Government should do us justice, and his disposition to write anything that might be proper to promote the same temper there ; and I am willing to believe that this was his real and principal inducement for asking the information contained in this list. [At the same time I am aware that it might be for purposes of an opposite nature and I know that the French Minister of Foreign Affairs has informed the French Consul here that he

had received advices that much English property had been introduced here under the American flag, and has enjoined upon him a most vigilant attention and a report how the fact in this respect was. The report which was sent by the same courier with my letter I have reason to believe was as favorable so far as concerns Americans as the truth would warrant. The Consul] has declared to me his opinion that every vessel which has arrived this year at Cronstadt *with a cargo* under any other than American colours, was loaded on English account. The number of those vessels however amounts only to eleven. As to the Americans he assured me that he fully credited the statement which I made verbally to him in conversation, and that he would report accordingly to his Government. I told him that, independent of any credit which he might be disposed to give me from confidence, he might observe that the *interest* of my countrymen trading here was impulse enough for them and me to detect as much as we could the counterfeit who came as their competitors in the market, and as to the introduction of English property here, I asked his attention to two facts which in my mind amounted to complete demonstration that its amount had really been very small. The first was that during the whole season no insurance had been obtainable in London, upon shipments of goods to Russian ports in the Baltic, and the other that the course of exchange had constantly been from fifty to sixty per cent. against England and in favour of Russia. He admitted the weight of these facts, of the first of which he had not been aware ; and he said he should not fail to avail himself of both in his report. Of the American vessels, thirty-three came in ballast, and I presume were either freighted in England, or came here for freights to England. In all these cases the Government here have scarcely wished to look at the Papers. Mr. [Gurieff, the Minister (of) Finance, to whose Department this matter now belongs, once told me in express terms that if a ship came empty he did not care whence she came, and was not inclined to scrutinize what she was.] This disposition obtained admission for the Crescent, though reported by Mr. Harris as irregular, and came very near carrying through the Angerona, when the Captain lost his papers to secure their forgery from detection. [The Ambassador and Consul know very well that these ships that came in ballast will return bound to England for whatever port they may have cleared out. When they have been real Americans I have not felt myself obliged to be more scrupulous in enquiring whence they came than the Russian Government ; it was not my duty to accuse them nor to point them out by any discrimination from the rest. They will] doubtless [return as they came under convoy, and will be in very little danger of capture either by French or Danish privateers. Their freightings are certainly profitable to the general mass of our commerce, but I think it necessary to say *to you* that abuse of our flag is more difficult to detect in their trading than in the case of forgery. I have my suspicions that in more than one instance of those that came this summer, altho' the vessel and papers and even the master and crew were really American,

the property was English ; and I am not sure there were not cases in which everything was English but the papers. I feel my whole bounden duty therefore once more to suggest the expediency of further legislative provision against the sale of real American ships papers whether (with) or without the ship in foreign ports.]

There have been indeed several cases of American vessels, which came with *Cargoes* last from England ; the admission of which I have obtained. But they have all been accompanied with proof that they were dispatched from the United States, and bound here, and that they have been detained in English ports, either by capture, by stress of weather, or by the necessity of repairing or *changing* the ship. The proofs have been clear. I have interfered without hesitation, and in every instance have obtained their admission. I know also of several instances in which vessels under similar circumstances obtained admission without my interference. [There have been so many of them in all that possibly other causes than mere compulsion made some of them touch at English ports. I know that before the navigation opened this Government received notice from Mr. Daschkoff that a large proportion of the American vessels coming to Russia this season would take England in their way. This was not forbidden by any law of the United States. How far it was compatible with the law of Russia was for this Government to determine. I never disguised or even concealed a fact from them which could bear upon the principle when I asked for a favour or an exemption from the rigour of the *Ukaze*, and many vessels have been admitted which the rigour of the *Ukaze* would have excluded. It is not probable that any further questions of this nature will occur the present year, and it is too (ear)ly to look forward for the ruling principles of the next, but it is not too soon to say that the safety of our real commerce with Russia may still depend upon its discrimination from the imposture which assumes its garb.]

My quarterly account is enclosed, with which I have still to repeat the request at the close of my letter N. 57, dated 6 July last.

I am, with great respect, Sir,

Your very hu^{bl} and obd^r serv^t.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great. By J. B. BURY, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Dublin. (London: Macmillan and Co. 1900. Pp. xxiii, 909.)

THERE are already so many good histories of Greece that the inquisitive public asks each newcomer to explain first of all why he was born. Though in his preface Mr. Bury does not offer the much desired apology, a glance at his book shows the main feature to be his novel treatment of prehistoric Greece. Undoubtedly the recent researches of Mr. Evans and other archaeologists have added much to our knowledge of that early age; the simple question is whether Mr. Bury has successfully adapted this new information to the already known facts.

While as a rule authorities now agree that the Mycenaean civilization flourished as early as 1500 B. C., recent discoveries make it appear probable that this culture was preceded by more primitive stages, which reached back perhaps a thousand years further into the past. Mr. Bury, then, is safe in dating the beginnings of the *Æ*gean civilization from the third millennium B. C. His assertion, however, that this civilization preceded the arrival of the Greeks in their historic home is pure speculation; for archaeology does not distinguish races; we should not confound areas of civilization with ethnological groups. But Mr. Bury rests his faith on a few names of places. "Corinth and Tiryns, Parnassus and Olympus, Arne and Larisa, are names which the Greeks received from the peoples whom they dispossessed." While it is possible to make all sorts of guesses as to the origin of this or that word, no one can prove that the names in his list are not as thoroughly Greek as any in the language. Indeed it is most improbable that before the arrival of the Greeks, any one language extended over the coasts and islands of the *Æ*gean Sea. We could more reasonably assume a multitude of dialects with little or no relation to one another.

Mr. Bury attempts, further, to trace the migrations, conquests, and settlements of various races in Greece through the third and second millennia B. C. To those who are acquainted with our lack of knowledge of this subject it is needless to say that his whole treatment is purely conjectural. Even his positive assertions are either extremely doubtful or absolutely wrong. "We know," he says "that there were Pelasgians in Thessaly and in Attica." Rather we are almost certain there were no Pelasgians in Attica. He has also a theory, the product of his imagination, that most of the historic Atticans were non-Hellenic, that the Ionian

(or Javonic) invaders, though Greek, were very few. The evanescent nature of such speculation appears from the fact that before his book is through the press, he declares that neither the name nor the nation of Javones (Ionians) is Greek! But anything may be expected of a writer who accepts as history the evident fiction that the Cyprian Salamis was settled from the Salamis off the Attic coast. The fact is that so far as these early chapters indicate, Mr. Bury has not advanced beyond the childish methods of the ancient Greeks; he has not taken his first lesson in sound historical criticism. As a result of this lack of training, his chapters on the prehistoric age are a series of groundless or untenable hypotheses.

His treatment of constitutional history is equally faulty; we constantly happen upon statements which we are compelled to doubt or deny. The village was not, as he asserts, a *genos* (*gens*); the *gens* was not a primitive institution, and is not mentioned by Homer. There is no evidence that the *phyle* ever existed as an independent kingdom, or that the common people were ever excluded from the phratries, or that Solon established a "Council of Four Hundred and One." And it is not probable that this statesman provided for filling offices by a "mixed method of election and lot." It is difficult for the reader to understand, too, how an artificial tribal system introduced from Miletus could at the same time be "based on birth." Much else might be offered to show how confused is Mr. Bury's mind on various topics which are clearly and accurately treated in other books. Considerable stretches of his work, however, show contact with fresh German scholarship. The admirer of Busolt will find much in this new history to remind him of his old friend. Undoubtedly it is a merit in Mr. Bury to have depended on so good an authority; but he could have done his countrymen a better service by translating Busolt or Beloch into English; for these historians represent something substantial, and their works, therefore, have a lasting value.

G. W. B.

A History of Greece. By EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D., Jowett Lecturer in Greek History at Balliol College. Part III. From the Thirty Years' Peace to the Fall of the Thirty at Athens, 445-403 B. C. (London: Longmans. New York: Putnams. 1900. Pp. viii, 561.)

PART I. of this history, which appeared in 1888, extends to the Ionian Revolt; Part II., published four years afterward, reaches the Treaty of 445 B. C.; and the present volume not only continues the narrative to the fall of the Thirty at Athens, 403 B. C., but also includes a chapter on the literature, art, religion, and society of the Greeks in the fifth century. Though the first five chapters have been taken with some modifications from Mr. Abbott's well known work on Pericles, the remainder of the book is entirely new.

The author tells us that his history "is intended for readers who are acquainted with the outlines of the subject, and have some knowledge of the Greek language. It has been written in the belief that an intelligible sketch of Greek civilization may be given within a brief compass—not in the hope of throwing new light on old obscurities, or quoting fresh evidence where all the evidence has been long ago collected." In accordance with this plan of preparing a work for the general student of Greek civilization, the author rarely cites authorities or discusses the relative value of the ancient sources. On the other hand, the compass of his history, which is much wider than he at first designed, enables him to consider all the important events, yet with far greater brevity than Grote and Curtius have employed.

The most marked characteristic of the author is his sober, colorless statement of facts, or of what he believes to be facts. Avoiding premature hypotheses, he studiously reproduces the view of those ancient writers who are usually set down as most conservative and reliable. At the same time the arrangement of the material is admirable throughout ; and the language, though without ornament or feeling, is uniformly clear. These qualities, with the good index at the end of each volume, make his history an excellent work of reference for all who are interested in ancient Greece. Most readers, however, will find more to attract them in Grote, or Curtius, or even in Holm, for these writers have put their souls into their work. We miss in Abbott not only the partisan fervor of Grote but also the delicate emotion for landscape, art, and character which distinguishes Curtius. While Holm is fresh and suggestive, in Abbott we rarely find a new idea ; he has sacrificed brilliancy of every kind to scholarly reserve.

It is a question whether this reserve should be considered an unqualified virtue. In the present volume, for instance, Mr. Abbott invariably accepts Thucydides's estimate of men and of events. There can be no reasonable doubt, however, that the great Greek historian was prejudiced against the democratic leaders of Athens after Pericles. Certainly Cleon and Hyperbolus were not so thoroughly bad as Thucydides represents them to be. It is the duty of the impartial historian, accordingly, to attempt to place these men in their true light ; and the task is extremely difficult, for Thucydides has a subtle way of concealing his partisanship. Again, it hardly seems reasonable to assume that Thucydides is in all points infallible, that the scholar is bound to follow him blindly, whenever he disagrees with other authorities. But Mr. Abbott in his treatment of the Four Hundred refuses to learn anything from Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*, because (1) Thucydides was contemporary, and (2) his narrative is vivid and impressive whereas that of Aristotle is confused. These reasons are not in themselves convincing ; for every one knows that the later historian, with his opportunity for the study of documents, has an advantage over a contemporary whose knowledge is perhaps mere hearsay. It is well known, too, that Greek and Roman history

has suffered much from scholars whose literary taste has led them to judge the accuracy of a writer by the quality of his style.

This criticism of the author's method should by no means be taken as a condemnation of his work. The reader of the present volume understands that he is following Thucydides ; and if it is his wish to view political parties and leaders at Athens from the standpoint of a great though prejudiced contemporary, he may consider himself fortunate in having so faithful and so trustworthy a guide as Mr. Abbott. In brief the work is remarkably careful and accurate ; and the merit of the volumes which have thus far appeared inspires the hope that the entire history will fill a large sphere of positive usefulness.

G. W. B.

A History of England for the Use of Schools and Academies. By J. N. LARNED, with Topical Analyses, Research Questions and Bibliographical Notes, by Homer P. Lewis, Principal of the English High School, Worcester, Mass. (Boston : Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1900. Pp. xxxiii, 673.)

In his preface Mr. Larned states that his aim in writing this book has been to tell "the things most essential with simple clearness, in such an order and so connectedly as to show streams of influence and cause flowing through them," so that the reader may feel himself led "easily along the main lines of development that flow through English history." This has been done with a considerable degree of success. The subject-matter is divided into seven periods: Britain and Early England ; The Norman-English Nation ; The Decline of Feudalism ; Renaissance and Reformation ; A Century of Revolution ; The Period of Aristocratic Government ; and The Democratic Era ; and these are handled in such a way as to present a narrative of the nation's development that is both consecutive and interesting, and possesses more literary merit than one often finds in a text-book. The array of wars—both foreign and domestic,—and the intricacies of the royal genealogies are happily subordinated to the constitutional, social, and industrial development of the people, and the territorial expansion of the nation, while the lines of such development are well-defined. That a few of the estimates of character—both of individuals and of nations—are emphatic rather than judicial, it would be difficult to deny. Elizabeth's greatness is scantily recognized ; and the author gives us the impression that "no good thing can come out of" Spain.

Of the seven periods enumerated, The Century of Revolution (1603-1688) is treated with the greatest detail. To it are given 106 pages, while the period 1450-1603 covers 77 pages, and that from 1688 to 1820, 94 pages.

There are interpolated, at various intervals throughout the text, Surveys of General History,—one for the first seven centuries following the fall of Rome, and one for each century after the twelfth. These are in-

tended for the use of the teacher rather than for that of the pupil, and they would seem to add little to the usefulness of the volume. They are too brief to help the pupil, and a well-equipped teacher would regard them as superfluous.

Each chapter is followed by topics giving a synopsis of the text, accompanied by references for further reading, prepared by Mr. Homer P. Lewis, Principal of the English High School at Worcester, Mass. These references are selected—so Mr. Larned says in his preface—with regard to adaptability for school use. The list is by no means complete. Such works as Prothero's *Select Statutes and Other Documents* and Gardiner's *Documents of the Puritan Revolution* should surely find a place among any working list of books upon English history. A list of references should also make some distinction between original and secondary material. The book has an excellent index. The maps are commendable, and the illustrations are well-chosen, if not always well-executed.

GERTRUDE S. KIMBALL.

The Welsh People. By JOHN RHYS and DAVID BRYNMOR JONES.
(New York: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Pp. xxvi, 678.)

THE title of this work is skilfully chosen to cover a variety of subjects. The book consists partly of extracts from the *Report of the Royal Commission on Land* in Wales and Monmouthshire, and partly of new matter written later. The additional chapters make up about half the volume, which deals with the ethnology, political and economic history, constitutional law, language and literature, and finally the educational and religious conditions of the Welsh people. If it purported to be a history of Wales, the choice of subjects might appear arbitrary and the treatment sometimes disproportionate. But the book is rather to be judged as a series of chapters embodying contributions to such a history, and the contributions are valuable.

The authors begin by dealing pretty fully with the ethnology of Wales, and incidentally with that of England and Ireland. They show that the race, or rather people, commonly termed Celtic is of very mixed origin, and they conclude that the blood of a "pre-Aryan" population predominates in the modern Welshman. This pre-Aryan people they hold to have survived in the historic Picts, and in a long chapter on the Pictish question they present very fully the arguments for their view. The opinion that the Picts were non-Aryan in race and speech undoubtedly holds the field at present, as they maintain, though with regard to the language the controversy is not conclusively settled.

Students of Celtic literature,—and in general, students of popular epics and romances,—will find in these ethnological chapters a good many valuable comments on the old Welsh and Irish saga texts. From this point of view the remarks on possible survivals of matriarchy,—the succession of sister's sons to a title, metronymic designations, and the like,—are of especial interest. The authors also have some things to say about

the literary relations between Wales and Ireland in the earliest periods. They take issue with the opinion expressed by Dr. Kuno Meyer (in the *Transactions of the Society of Cymrodorion*, 1895-1896, pp. 71 ff.) that everything Goidelic in Britain is to be traced to invasions from Ireland, and they maintain on their side that much is to be attributed to the Goidelic settlers who preceded the Brythonic tribes in Britain and who, in their opinion, were never expelled or exterminated. It is obvious that this is a problem of literary history as well as of ethnology. There is very little mention of Druidism in the book. In a brief reference to it (on page 83) the authors indicate their opinion that this system belonged particularly to the Goidelic rather than the Brythonic Celts, a theory from which bold inferences have been drawn by Mr. J. W. Willis Bund in his history of the *Celtic Church of Wales*.

The third chapter begins the more definitely historical portion of the book and recounts briefly the chief events during the Roman occupation of Britain. It gives some description of the colonial government and discusses the distribution of the different tribes on the island. Chapters IV., V. and VII. furnish a compact summary of Welsh history from the time of Cunedda till the conquest of the Principality by Edward I. There is very little detailed narrative and the authors announce at the outset that they "do not affect to write a history of Wales," a task which appears to them impossible with the materials at command. What they give is rather a scientific survey of the field with a sober criticism of the sources. Just this indication of the present state of knowledge is of great value at this time.

Chapter VI. gives a rather full account of the customs and institutions of the ancient Welsh. It is based on the collection of laws ascribed to Howel Dda, which the authors accept as being in substance an "authentic evidence of the condition of the Cymry in the tenth century." Chapter VIII. (on the legal and constitutional history) traces with some detail the successive steps in the organization of Wales under English rule. Chapter IX. deals with the history of land-tenure in Wales and is the work of Mr. Frederic Seeböhm, who was associated with Messrs. Rhys and Jones in the Royal Commission.

The later chapters of the book are principally a description of modern Wales, its language, religions and educational systems, and the conditions of life that prevail among its people. A good deal of information not easily found elsewhere is here brought together.

Of especial interest to the comparative philologist is the appendix contributed by Professor J. Morris Jones of Bangor on "Pre-Aryan Syntaxis in Insular Celtic."

It is a pity that a number of bad misprints (on pages 25, 110, for example) should have been allowed to stand in a book of which the press-work is on the whole so attractive. In Table A (facing page 174) Llewelyn ab Gruffydd is twice printed for Gruffydd ab Llewelyn. An oversight of a different sort appears on page 53 where two lines are quoted from the Irish *Fled Bricrend*, though they really come from

another saga, the *Serglige Conculaind*. Mistakes like these are trivial, but they are sometimes annoying out of all proportion to their importance.

F. N. ROBINSON.

Calendar of Documents preserved in France, illustrative of the History of Great Britain and Ireland. Edited by J. HORACE ROUND, M.A. Vol. I., A.D. 918-1206. (London: Printed for her Majesty's Stationery Office, by Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1899. Pp. iv, 680.)

HOWEVER much scholars may have been disposed to regret in the past the long delay in the publication of the transcripts of French charters, made two generations ago for the Public Record Office, everyone may now rejoice in the fact. It would have been difficult to find another English scholar so competent for this task as Mr. J. Horace Round who has now completed it. There may have been some as competent upon the side of diplomatic, or in special points more so, and some with as great a knowledge of the other sources of the period or of the history of the early families, but the combination in Mr. Round's case has never been rivalled. One has only to glance through these pages to learn how much we owe to the editor's pains and knowledge. Not merely has the number of the charters been largely increased, over the original transcript, but there are frequent corrections of the text both in the body of the charters and in the lists of witnesses, some of them of great importance. The labor spent upon this work, which only those can estimate who are familiar with its demands, must have been enormous.

The first question which one asks about such a work is naturally: how has the calendaring been done? Can we depend upon it to give us the really important points so that we may use it with confidence, when the original is inaccessible? I am sure that no one who has read many charters can read more than two or three of the important ones of this book without saying to himself: Of the most essential parts, this is not a calendar at all; it is a translation. Comparison with the full text of such of the charters as are to be had in print shows this to be actually the case. Two other points are to be noticed. In the body of the charters, throughout the book, the original words are inserted in parenthesis where there may be any reasonable doubt about the rendering, or where there is any especial interest attaching to them, and the lists of witnesses are given in the original in every case. There is no need to call attention to the importance of these two matters.

If we compare this calendar with the latest work in the same line of the Germans, who have devoted so much attention to this method of publication, with the second edition of the Böhmer-Mühlbacher Carolingian *Regesten* for example, which bears the same date on the title-page, we feel no need of apologizing for the English work. There are many fewer references to printed texts of the charters, or to studies on them,

but this is because the texts and studies do not yet exist. The English calendar is not at all an itinerary nor an index to the chronicles or other sources, but this was not desired. In its bearing on the political or narrative history of the time, the English work is no better than the German and not so easy to use. As material for institutional history, however, it is decidedly superior. The German is hardly more than an index, and in the great majority of cases reference must be made to the full text, while in the case of the English in an equally large majority of cases this is not at all necessary. The point is stated in full, in fact the text is translated. To many of us on this side of the water, this is a matter of great importance. The American student, interested in Norman or feudal institutions, but stranded by some mysterious oversight of Providence far from a good library, has here, at a merely nominal cost as compared with printed cartularies, 1500 charters of these three centuries in a form to meet practically all his needs. He will find his reasons for gratitude increased by the addition to the careful index of names of an *index rerum*—not by any means complete even in the subjects that are noticed, but very welcome nevertheless.

It is probable that more that is strictly new may be learned from this book in family and local than in institutional history, but a great number of points of law and practice receive illustration, some of it by no means common. Most of the points which are new Mr. Round has noticed in his preface. One of the most interesting of these is the discovery in No. 1205 of the "sheriff of the honor of Pevensey." Mr. Round does not make it clear in his remarks whether he supposes the Walter of this charter to have been a king's sheriff, or the Count of Mortain's own *vicomte* for the honor, but as one charter clearly shows that the count recovered possession of the land which Walter had seized by a suit in his own court he probably means the latter. If this interpretation of the case is correct, we have here the best illustration yet found of what is a very rare use of the word in England, and one much less common in Normandy itself than in some other parts of France. Charter No. 757 of the *Gloucester Cartulary* (Vol. II., p. 197) may be compared with No. 1122 of Mr. Round's *Calendar*. These instances do not prove that the grantors actually had officers whom they called *vicomtes*, but they do show that such a use of the word was not strange to them.

The feudal court, whether royal or baronial, receives in these charters constant illustrations on all sides, of composition, procedure, and competence. Interesting instances are: the oral examination of witnesses before the court in Nos. 78 and 1190, but there is here no case so interesting as that recorded in Boutaric, *Actes du Parlement de Paris*, I. ccxcviii, No. 4; the election or appointment of a committee of the court to go apart to consider the case and decide it in Nos. 712, 1114, and 1257, a very old practice; the trial of appeals to the Pope by local ecclesiastics appointed by him from whose decision there was no appeal, Nos. 143-147; suits of the lord in his own court, Nos. 232, 799, 1205;

an ecclesiastical suit before a secular tribunal "according to the custom of Normandy," No. 1257, but the cartulary of La Couture, No. XVI., records a suit between the same parties before an ecclesiastical tribunal. These cases are mentioned only as illustrations. Almost a complete statement of the judicial usages of feudalism could be made from this volume.

The *Calendar* gives us renewed and conclusive evidence of the close similarity, in fact of the identity, of all the arrangements here coming to notice, public and private, on the two sides of the channel. There was no doubt a real sense in which the two governments were distinct, but there were ways in which they were constantly running together. There seems to have been no difference between *curia regis* and *curia ducis*, and officers from one country serve without comment in the other. In fact the classes that move and act in these charters, nobles and ecclesiastics, seem to regard the two countries, for all practical purposes, as one land.

GEORGE BURTON ADAMS.

The Venetian Republic: Its Rise, its Growth, and its Fall, 421-1797. By W. CAREW HAZLITT. (London: Adam and Charles Black; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Two vols., pp. xxvii, 814, xi, 815.)

THIS is the third and final edition of the work which Mr. Hazlitt first published as a sketch in 1858, and republished, much expanded, in 1860. It would almost be proper to call it a new work, since one of its volumes contains quite as much matter as all the four volumes of 1860 contained, and, while much of the substance of the earlier edition reappears here, it has been greatly modified. The history now ends not with the tragedy of the Foscari, but with the extinction of the Republic in 1797. Thus the narrative, instead of breaking off arbitrarily in the middle of the fifteenth century, is complete, allowing the reader to contemplate that last impressive period in the life of Venice—the period of unparalleled magnificence behind which lurked unsuspected ruin.

A captious critic might easily point out that a work produced by successive accretions cannot have that unity and symmetry which belong to the highest works of art—whether they be histories, paintings or poems—giving them the effect of having been created by a single swift, masterful stroke; even when we know, as in the case of *The Divine Comedy*, that the act of creation extended over many years. More serious than this defect, especially in a history, would be the evidence that the author had not kept up with the unearthing of new material, which, in what relates to Venice, has been both bulky and important during the past forty years. So far as the present reviewer has observed, however, Mr. Hazlitt has not slighted the new stores of material, although he has probably set a different value on some of them from what he would have done had he begun to write in 1890 instead of in 1857. Comparing the edition of

1860 with this last, one finds changes not only in form but also in substance, indicating that the work has been remoulded, and not merely revised. There has been a gain too in style, due chiefly to the greater compression which Mr. Hazlitt has learned to practise. He is still too diffuse in places, still overfond of giving free rein to a natural propensity for digressing; but even this fulness has its advantage, when it leads him, for instance, to print entire the last speeches of Doge Tommaso Mocenigo (I. 800-806).

But in a notice as brief as the present, it is impossible to criticize details without creating a false impression as to the worth of the work as a whole. Of this, there should be no doubt. Mr. Hazlitt has written not only the best history of Venice in English, but he has excelled any histories in Italian, French, or German that compete with him. On special periods, or topics, several other historians have written authoritatively, but it is somewhat singular that the whole field should have been so long neglected. Daru, the "regulation" historian of Venice before Hazlitt, wrote too early to have access to indispensable material. Mr. Horatio F. Brown, the only other recent English writer, contented himself with a sketch, admirable in many respects, but still only a sketch. Whoever reads Hazlitt may rest assured, therefore, that he has before him the best history of Venice, whatever may be its limitations, now in existence.

As a supplement to the history itself, Mr. Hazlitt has added twenty-five chapters, equal to more than a fourth of the whole work, on the manners, customs, topography, government, police, church, commerce, laws, coinage, dwellings, education, drama, literature, and charitable institutions of Venice. Such an encyclopaedia of information cannot be found elsewhere in a single book; had it been printed separately, it would have sufficed to establish a permanent reputation for its author. He has overlooked no detail, however minute, and as he arranges his material chronologically, one follows the development of a custom, or of an institution, from its origin to its ending, in the most instructive way. Needless to say, the view we thus get of the Venetians in their daily life enables us the better to understand their history; and, finally, it is unflaggingly entertaining. Nobody can close this history without acknowledging that Mr. Hazlitt has succeeded in his purpose of telling the truth about Venice and the Venetians. By so doing, he dispels the old notion that they were a people delighting in dark crimes. He shows how, on the contrary, they led Europe for many centuries in the essentials for civilization, not less than in trade and wealth. Out of their character there grew up one of the most interesting forms of government the world has seen—an oligarchy, which not only inspired the most fervent devotion of the masses whom it was supposed to oppress, but which also, unlike all other oligarchies, was long-lived. Mr. Hazlitt's monumental work ought to draw attention anew to the constitution of that state which, though sea-born, and cradled in the shifting mud of the lagoons, proved more durable than any other in history. Before the Roman Empire fell,

the fighting Veneti had set up their infant republic ; George Washington had just ceased to be President of the United States, when that Republic was extinguished : between these two events there stretches more than thirteen hundred years of Venetian history.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

Serfs et Vilains au Moyen Age. Par HENRI DONIOL. (Paris : Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1900. Pp. vi, 299.)

The End of Villainage in England. By THOMAS WALKER PAGE, Ph.D. (New York : The Macmillan Co. Published for the American Economic Association. 1900. Pp. 99.)

ALONG with the many new works that have been produced recently as a result of the deeper interest that has grown up in the condition of the mass of the people in past times, appears this work by M. Doniol enunciating his views on medieval servitude and its disappearance. It is professedly but a restatement of conclusions reached and published more than forty years ago in his *Histoire des Classes Rurales en France*. Indeed it bears only too clearly the marks of the historical work of that period. Few specific references are given for his statements. Indeed he deprecates exclusive reliance upon authorities, and repeatedly enforces the claims of the "probability of things," "induction based upon probability," and "universal acceptance." His practice follows this theory. For example he says : "If we go back in thought to the tribe we can see quite evidently how the different modes of subjection established themselves;" and then proceeds to draw a picture, quite fanciful so far as any records of the past show, of the origination of two forms of servitude. For better or for worse, methods of historical investigation and exposition have changed greatly during the half-century between M. Doniol's earlier and later work.

But even undeveloped methods in the hands of a master may produce results of the greatest importance, and M. Doniol is one of the greatest of French historians. Such a statement of his conclusions as this cannot therefore be without interest and value. His book is practically a study of the distinction between villains and serfs in medieval France, and of the enfranchisement of the latter class. He draws the clearest line of distinction between the two classes. Villains were free, serfs not free. The villain was a subject to be taxed, the serf an article of possession. Villainage was the result of the possession of political rights by feudal lords, serfdom of their possession of lands to be worked. Villains were the subjects of the lordship, serfs its servants.

M. Doniol devotes the greater part of his work to a description of the position of these two classes, respectively. The serfs he treats as a comparatively homogeneous body. The class of villains is defined much more widely, including persons described by many different names in the documents, and possessing many different characteristics. Even the townsman, the merchant, and the handcraftsman of the early Middle Ages appear in this category.

The most instructive and original portion of M. Doniol's work, however, lies in the chapters which trace the emancipation of the serf. According to his statements emancipation became active about the middle of the thirteenth century and was practically completed within two hundred years. Liberty was offered by lords to their serfs before it was asked for by them. Enfranchisement was granted by the king to the serfs on his domains earlier than by any private lords on theirs.

This was because the king wanted taxable subjects more than he wanted laborers. The town corporations were the next to emancipate their serfs, the noblemen followed; the ecclesiastical corporations were the last. Notwithstanding the vast number of written charters of emancipation, the greater part of the work of enfranchisement was done by tacit agreement. Emancipation was a purely local change differing in time and character in different provinces; Normandy being the earliest to free itself from serfdom, Burgundy the last. Among the various reasons for difference of period of enfranchisement in different localities the character of the soil was the most important. For a century or more the serfs had no great desire to be freed, then freedom became attractive to them and their desires and those of the lord's corresponded, so that servitude rapidly became exceptional.

This is all extremely suggestive and interesting, and it may be true,—indeed much of it undoubtedly is, but M. Doniol has neither proved it nor given us the necessary means of proving or disproving it. One cannot get rid of a feeling of doubt and uncertainty. May not his fundamental distinction between serfs and villains be an arbitrary or imaginary one? That distinction did not exist in any positive institutional sense across the Channel. Indeed M. Doniol's own reservations in the course of discussion make the distinction very tenuous indeed in medieval France.

Mr. Page's work, in contrast with that just described, is a study of entirely new material, most of it never read by any previous student, much less utilized for historical purposes. His statements moreover are always fortified by direct references and his generalizations supported by a sufficient number of recorded facts. His pamphlet is threefold in subject, giving first a description of the institution of villainage as it existed in the thirteenth century; second, disproof of any considerable change in that institution before the middle of the fourteenth century; and lastly, an analysis of the course of change from that time forward until villainage had become a thing of the past by the close of the fifteenth century.

The first section is of inferior importance, having become by this time a matter of commonplace knowledge. In the other two divisions of his subject Mr. Page has fulfilled three tasks of a negative character which immediately attract attention. He shows, in opposition to the statements of Professor Rogers, that there had been but little commutation of labor services for money payments before 1350. He has examined records dated between 1325 and 1350 of eighty-one manors, and finds in more than half of them practically no commutation and in but six complete commutation of praedial services. Similarly Professor Rogers's suggestion that

has been so widely accepted, that a return to labor services was enforced by the lords upon the villain tenants after the Black Death is shown to be a mistake, for the records of one hundred and twenty-six manors within the thirty years following the pestilence show no single instance of such an increase or return, but quite the contrary process. Thirdly, the distinction between serfs and villains, between tenure in bondage and tenure in villainage, is shown to have had no existence in the usage of manorial courts or in other manorial records, the only place where such a distinction could have had any importance if it had existed. Villains, *nativi*, customary tenants, and persons described by several other terms were undifferentiated except in the discussions of some medieval and modern lawyers. The change of labor services into money payments progressed with great rapidity after the pestilence of 1348-1349 and this was tantamount to the cessation of villainage as a form of tenure. Regular money payments had not that character of uncertainty which kept the villain subject to the manorial bailiff, excluded him from the king's courts, and kept his tenure like his personal status, servile. Mr. Page carefully distinguishes villain status from villain tenure, and treats their disappearance as two separate though dependent movements. But the first is more satisfactorily done than the second. He notices the leasing out of the demesne as progressing coincidently with the process of commutation, but does not repeat the valuable statistics on this point given in his pamphlet, *Die Umwandlung der Frohndienste*. But does he not miss here perhaps the most important incentive to the non-enforcement of the disabilities of villains? It was not that commutation made villainage of less interest to the lords because they could not now get labor for the demesne if they wanted to, but that by the leasing of their demesnes they did not any longer want a labor supply even if they could have obtained it.

Mr. Page makes a mistake in stating that enfranchisement came later in France than in England, as M. Doniol's book shows. But this is one of very few slips. In the matter of which his book is a special study he shows the firmness of touch, the clearness of views and the originality of interpretation which can only come from much close contact with the sources from which all our knowledge must be drawn.

E. P. CHEYNEY.

Luther and the German Reformation. By THOMAS M. LINDSAY, D.D., Professor of Church History, Free Church College, Glasgow. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. xii, 300.)

THE new series of small and handy volumes entitled "The World's Epoch-Makers" opens well. The editor seems to have placed the successive topics for discussion in competent hands. Certainly Dr. Lindsay is a successful and enthusiastic student of his particular theme. Of this he gave proof in a remarkable paper read before "the Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System" at its fifth gen-

eral Council held in Toronto, in September, 1892. This paper which he entitled "The Protestant Reformation: its Spiritual Character and its Fruits in the Individual Life," clearly indicated the standpoint from which by preference he views the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Between the ground there taken and that of his later volume there is possibly a shade of difference. In the former he appears to regard the religious as the only correct interpretation of the great movement in question. "It is impossible," he there writes, "to state all the various ways in which men have misread the Reformation, but for the sake of showing its intrinsic spiritual character let me refer to three, which may be called the political, the intellectual, and the social." In his book, on the other hand, while retaining in great measure the phraseology of his earlier essay, he admits that other views may in themselves be correct; that, for example, the movement may be treated as an intellectual movement with Erasmus then as its central figure, and "studied but scarcely explained from this point of view." Essentially, however, there is no change; and the position is assumed, and correctly assumed, in our opinion, that "when Luther is taken as the central figure, one—the religious—must dominate all the other points of view, and the various intricate intermingled movements must be regarded as the environment of this one central impulse."

It is not necessary to say more in this connection than that Dr. Lindsay has carried out his thought consistently, forcibly and in a genuine scholarly fashion. The style is fresh and animated. The book is as remote as possible from being heavy reading. It avoids unnecessary minutiae, makes no pretense of being exhaustive, and contains few or no marginal notes. Intended for general readers, it naturally avoids any display of authorities, although it is evidently built upon a firm foundation of solid scholarship studiously hidden away from view. The interest is the greater from the fact that the author, as he tells us, has striven to show that "although Luther's life has been written scores of times there still is room for another,—for one which will be careful to set Luther in the environment of the common social life of his time." Dr. Lindsay does indeed take the pains to disclaim the pretension that his book is even a sketch of the reformer's life written in this way. But no reader, especially of the chapters treating of Luther's more intimate life, will deny him the credit of having achieved success in this direction.

HENRY M. BAIRD.

The Silver Map of the World; A Geographical Essay, including some Critical Remarks on the Zeno Narrative and Chart of 1558 and on the Curious Misconception as to the Position of the Discoveries made by Frobisher. By MILLER CHRISTY. (London: Henry Stevens, Son and Stiles. 1900. Pp. xii, 71, 10 maps.)

THE problem of geographical discovery, and of every other kind of discovery, never was and never can be the adjustment of a newly dis-

covered thing to its relation with what succeeding generations may find to be the truth. The man who finds out something about which he knew nothing, be he scientist, scholar, or merely a sailing-master, does not try to guess what those who come after him will know about it; if he is wise he will rest content with the effort to fit the new thing into its proper place in relation to what is already known. When Martin Frobisher sailed between two headlands in a part of the world where no one so far as he knew had ever been before, he did not try to construct the prospective Admiralty chart of Davis Strait. He took the best maps of the world available when he sailed from England, and, because he was a man who had done things which taught him the probable values of contemporary cartographic evidence, the additions which he made to those maps were a surprisingly close approximation to what is now known to be the actual lay of the land and water in the northwestern Atlantic. If the home-keeping students who appropriated the result of his voyages and made them a part of the general stock of European information had been content to read Frobisher's data carefully, as it was represented on the maps drawn by men who worked under his immediate influence, geographical progress would have been spared the delay of two centuries of mistaken notion regarding the coast line of southern Greenland. Mr. Miller Christy, in his essay on "The Silver Map of Drake's Voyage," shows some of the ways in which this misconception arose and what its results have been. The story is an instructive lesson for every student who feels a call to explain and elucidate the apparent errors of his predecessors.

Mr. Christy's work is in many respects one of the most suggestive of recent essays in geographical history. His subject is a silver medallion, commemorative of Drake's circumnavigation voyage of 1577-1580, which was probably designed by the same "F. G." who signed the exquisite and engraved map issued with Hakluyt's edition of Peter Martyr's *De Orbe Novo* in 1587. The medallion, which has hitherto been virtually unknown to students of cartography, shows a tracing of Drake's route, with the names of the more important places visited during the first English voyage around the world. Besides a photographic facsimile of the medallion, Mr. Christy illustrates his arguments with a number of contemporary maps, two of which have not been before available to students outside of London. One is an extremely interesting sailing chart prepared by William Borough, which appears to have been used by Frobisher in charting his discoveries during the voyage of 1576. The other is a projection, drawn by Mr. J. W. Addison, reproducing for the first time the North Atlantic configuration on the Molineux Globe in the Middle Temple, London. Aside from the maps, Mr. Christy's essay is especially useful as an illustration of the importance of considering contemporary events in their mutual relations. Francis Drake we commonly think of as a freebooter and circumnavigator; Frobisher was a searcher for the northwest passage and the gold mines thereabout; Zeno the younger was or was not a prince of impos-

tors. As Mr. Christy shows, the work of these men was intimately connected, and the significance of what each did cannot be understood without a careful appreciation of what the others were doing. Altogether, Mr. Christy has produced a thoroughly useful volume which is quite indispensable to any one who wishes to study the course of English American maritime history during the later years of the sixteenth century.

GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP.

English Political Philosophy from Hobbes to Maine. By WILLIAM GRAHAM, M.A. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1900. Pp. xxx, 415.)

THE problems of political philosophy belong in one aspect to philosophy, in another to jurisprudence, in another to history, and in yet another to the work of the publicist and reformer. The six authors, Hobbes, Locke, Burke, Bentham, Mill and Maine, whom Professor Graham has selected for treatment, well exemplify this variety of interests. Such a series must lend itself to quite different modes of treatment, according to the standpoint of the critic. Professor Graham, who occupies the chair of jurisprudence and political economy at Queens College, Belfast, is naturally most at home in the historical and jurisprudential rather than in the philosophical aspect of his subject, but he enters with zest into discussions of natural rights and natural law, utilitarianism and intuitionism, from an ethical as well as from a legal or political point of view.

The introduction to the work raises the question of method. Hobbes, Locke, and Bentham, it is stated, exemplify the deductive method, Maine the historical. Burke occupies a somewhat wavering position, employing the deductive method, but upon principles obtained either from experience or from history, whereas Hobbes and Locke start from an assumed state of nature and social contract. Bentham employs also the analytical method, which proceeds by analyzing and defining the leading conceptions, such as sovereignty. Mill, though advocating what he calls the inverse deductive method, which would verify historical inductions by psychological deductions, really relies chiefly on the deductive method. The author for his own part believes that the deductive method, temporarily eclipsed by Bentham's Theory of Legislation and next by the historical method, may be applied legitimately in reasoning "from our instinctive principles of justice." He holds that we may "attain to an *a priori* science of natural law or rights, and use and apply its principles deductively to new cases, as is certainly still done in courts of justice by our ablest judges." The question at once arises whether the conception of justice is not undergoing ceaseless transformation with the progress of civilization, and if so whether its ablest expositors really go back to "instinctive intuitions." In so far as there is moral progress this is found not in the instinctive aspect of our moral judgments—this instinctive

aspect stands for the factor of habit—but in the formation of new moral ideals, and this is the work not of instinct but of critical thought and constructive imagination. To make the methodology of the subject complete, mention should be made of the method which Kant attempted to introduce into all fields of philosophy—viz. the critical. Instead of deducing the logical consequences from certain supposititious primitive conditions, or laws of nature, or definitions of sovereignty, this begins at the other end, analyzes the existing political organism and discovers the principles which must be postulated if sovereignty and freedom, justice and progress, are to be accounted for.

The body of the work comprises an account of the leading political doctrines of the six authors named above, accompanied by criticism upon their logic and their statements of facts, or predictions as to the future. The accounts of the theories of the various writers are well done. Such a comprehensive abstract is especially valuable in the case of Burke, whose doctrines are scattered through many essays, and mixed with much rhetorical material, or in the case of Mill and Maine, whose various writings need to be compared.

As to the criticisms, those on Hobbes and Locke have less field for originality, as the defects of those writers have been frequently pointed out. Burke's misreading of the past and gloomy predictions as to the future are corrected. Bentham's work as a legislative reformer is praised, though his ethical theory is condemned as unpractical and illogical. With Mill's spirit, the author has much in sympathy, though he is more conservative than Mill on questions of property and woman's suffrage. He claims, and rightly, I think, that Mill's comparative failure was due to his lack in the intuitive vision, in the creative insight and speculative boldness which mark the work of a Hobbes or Rousseau. He might have added that Mill labored all his life under the burden of an intellectual heredity of atomistic psychology and mechanical philosophy from which he only partially worked free. Maine's historical method is recognized as highly important, but the author would supplement it as noted above, in the discussion of methods, and his judgments upon the working of democracy are much more favorable than those of Maine.

A word seems necessary as to the philosophical side of Professor Graham's treatment, inasmuch as this has considerable prominence. It was of course not obligatory upon the author to select any writer of the school of Green, Ritchie, and Bosanquet for exposition, but it seems strange that he has not profited by their work. He is conscious of the inadequacy of utilitarianism, and feels that a truth underlies the principle of natural rights, but he lacks the psychological analysis for stating this underlying truth in a tenable form. He falls back on "instincts," "sense" of justice, "implanted feelings" (pp. 236 ff., 382 ff.), without appreciating the difficulty that the mere presence of certain feelings is hardly a sufficient answer to the further question, whether these feelings should be made dominant or should be controlled or even suppressed in the interests of other feelings and instincts. He argues for law of

nature without noticing the ambiguities so clearly pointed out by Ritchie in the term "nature." He opposes intuitionism to utilitarianism without considering a third possibility, and similarly he opposes natural law to utilitarianism without giving any serious attention to the conception of a common will. He does not notice the implications of modern social psychology, which shows that the individual is a social outcome rather than a social unit, and that hence by virtue of his very dependence upon the social and political organism for freedom, rights, and development, he is bound to act as a member of this organism. This philosophical inadequacy, however, by no means interferes with the value of the work from other standpoints. For its able summaries, and its candid and judicious comments certainly make it a useful and welcome treatise.

JAMES H. TUFTS.

Histoire des Rapports de l'Église et de l'État en France de 1789 à 1870. Par A. DEBIDOUR. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1898. Pp. ii, 740.)

THIS large and elaborate history of the relations of Church and State in France during nearly a century, is the most valuable contribution to modern church history that has appeared for some time. The subject itself is of great importance and interest, comprising the whole story of the Church during the French Revolution, the settlement by Napoleon, and the resulting history down to the fall of the Second Empire. It involves the fundamental principles of ecclesiastical policy and innumerable interesting problems.

One of the most striking features of the book is the charming style in which it is written. One may read page after page of these long and solidly printed pages, not only without the slightest weariness, but with increasing interest and delight. The keen analyses, impartial judgments, broad views and critical scholarship find expression in a style which for grace and rhythm is rarely found in historical prose.

In his preface, the author, well known to readers of modern French history, declares that he has no thesis to maintain nor any special plea to present, but he does believe that a clear historical narrative will bring out two fundamental principles equally precious; freedom of worship and the sovereignty of the state. "The State," he says, "has no right to proscribe or fetter a religion which does not disturb public order nor has it any right to legislate in spiritual matters. But no religion ought, in my opinion, to encroach on the domain of civil society, and if, in consequence of such abuse, a conflict should arise between the two powers, the last word ought always to belong to the State."

The book opens with an extremely helpful and suggestive résumé of the relations of Church and State in the old régime, especially considering the Reformation settlement and its results in France down to the breaking out of the Revolution of 1789. The body of the work is divided into two parts: the first part, entitled "Revolution," dealing

with the history to the fall of Napoleon; the second, entitled "Réaction," continuing the history from 1814 to 1870. A "Conclusion" summarizes briefly but clearly the whole course of the history, noting the general principles involved and the most striking problems presented. An appendix furnishes an exceedingly valuable collection of documents comprising over a score of statutes, ordinances, decrees and encyclicals, those issued in Latin being given in a French translation. The work is copiously supplied with foot-notes, each chapter begins with a comprehensive bibliography of authorities, and an analytical table of contents completes the volume.

To give even the briefest sketch of the course of the history would require too much space, but certain points of special interest should not be left unnoticed.

The ecclesiastical problem which faced the nation in 1789 could be solved in only three ways: 1, Separation of Church and State; 2, A new Concordat, following that of 1516; 3, A state law imposed upon the Church by the civil authority. This last our author says rightly was the only course morally possible. Indeed it may be said fairly that those who condemn outright the Revolution settlement show themselves profoundly ignorant of the historical conditions. This settlement found its completion in the Concordat of 1801, recognizing the Roman Catholic religion as that of the great majority of French citizens, and allowing its free public exercise in conformity with the regulations of police.

M. Debidour explains the delay in the publication of the Concordat from July, 1801, when it was signed, until April, 1802, that Napoleon might join with it the Organic Articles which practically reasserted the Gallican liberties. If these had been revealed immediately after the signing of the Concordat, the Pope might have hindered him from carrying them out by retarding indefinitely, as far as it depended on him, the execution of the treaty. The court of Rome did protest, in vain however, against the Organic Articles, regarding which it had not been consulted and which Napoleon presented as inseparable from the Concordat. Here however Napoleon committed the error to which all victors are liable, that of pressing their victims too far and thus losing the fruits of their own victory. The Church in France was overwhelmed apparently by the civil power. The tendency therefore, for relief, was to turn to the Pope with a submission more docile and less independent than in the old régime. It is going too far, however, to say in the words which conclude the chapter: "The old régime made the clergy of France Gallican, Napoleon made it ultramontane." As I have said elsewhere,¹ "We might as well ask if the Concordat brought about ultramontanism everywhere. The Vatican Council of 1870 was not the council of French bishops alone; indeed there was quite as pronounced opposition to its decrees by the French clergy as by those of any other country in Europe." Ultramontanism was the next step in the papal policy; it was due to the restoration of the Jesuits, the abrogation of Napoleon's Concordat and

¹ *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* for 1895, p. 483.

the Organic Articles, and the substitution of a new Concordat in 1817, practically though not by legislation.

A careful review of the succeeding history in France shows the increasing friction between the two powers, the opposition of the Church becoming ever more dangerous to the state. The Church gained steadily a large part of the ground which it lost at the time of the Revolution. That it did not gain more is due to the growth of the modern spirit of democracy, the development of the common people forming the great middle class, free and sovereign. Grateful to the Revolution for what it had gained, the people suspected that party which so long checked the legitimate development of this great movement and retarded for nearly a century the definite establishment of the Republic. Since the establishment of the Republic, it is true that the clergy under the direction of a shrewd and politic Pope have changed somewhat their attitude toward the established government.

What the results will be it is too early to predict. Will they become reconciled once for all? Will they make mutual concession? Will one submit to the law of the other? Will they begin anew the strife? Will they enter into a complete separation? We know not and no one else knows.

CHARLES L. WELLS.

Die Kolonialpolitik Napoleons I. By GUSTAV ROLOFF. [Historische Bibliothek. Band X.] (Munich and Leipzig: R. Oldenbourg. 1899. Pp. xiv, 258.)

In the course of those repeated and almost frantic efforts to destroy the Napoleon legend which have been continuous in France since 1870 much wholesome truth has been widely disseminated, but with it some pernicious error. The men of Lanfrey's school pose like their leader as dispassionate seekers after truth, as stern devotees of historical science. But their bitter partisanship is easily discoverable by any who care to follow them in the course of their researches. Among other calumnies which he and they have circulated is the statement that Napoleon neither understood nor was interested in colonial affairs. This is a most remarkable charge, for any investigator may disprove it by means of the officially selected and published correspondence of Napoleon, volumes which stand on the shelves of any good library. But those who go further will be even more amazed by such effrontery. The author of this meritorious volume has examined the archives of the Navy Department in France and gives in his pages abundant proof that Napoleon's care for the colonies of France was intelligent, painstaking and assiduous. For reasons unknown to him the archives of the Foreign Office were not put at his disposal. But others have been permitted freely to search them, and they too furnish abundant evidence to the same effect.

This volume was needed. Everyone knows that the French lost their colonies in the Napoleonic epoch: most suppose that the loss was due to the Emperor's neglect. Dr. Roloff proves how utterly false this supposition is. He gives a succinct and readable narrative of the facts, he sup-

ports his statements by sufficient proof, and he shows satisfactorily how the central stream of European history was now and then affected by Napoleon's lavish expenditure of men and money at the ends of the earth. When the Directory fell, the French colonial empire, once so splendid, was no more. French rule had disappeared from India, Senegal and most of the Antilles; San Domingo was wrecked and virtually independent; mismanagement and peculation had almost ruined Guadeloupe, Réunion and the Ile de France; there was but one remaining possession, Guyana, where French authority was paramount. The French merchant marine had disappeared from the seas and the traffic of what were still called French colonies was conducted by traders from the United States.

Napoleon's Egyptian expedition, his Mediterranean policy in general, so ably sketched by Albert Vandal, the Herculean efforts he put forth to rescue San Domingo and the course of events in the Antilles: all these our author examines in the light of Napoleon's efforts to restore French control where but lately it had been complete. Further, he holds up the acquisition of Louisiana, and the reorganization of the colonies between the negotiation and breach of the treaty of Amiens as conclusive evidence that Napoleon had formed and was carefully working out a comprehensive plan. Incidentally a matter of vital historical importance is discussed, namely Napoleon's confidence in the solidity of his peace, as shown by his exertions for the colonies without reference to upbuilding a sea-power adequate for their defence, or a system of coast and harbor fortifications which would make them impregnable. This certainly does not point to a secret determination on Napoleon's part to bring on the wars which so long devastated western and central Europe.

Further we have a somewhat inadequate account of the social and economic conditions of the Antilles and of Decaen's interesting expedition to India. Between Austerlitz and Erfurt it became clear that in the complications of affairs in Europe France could not hope either for mastery at sea or for a marine peace. But even then Napoleon's activity was prodigious. He covered a new plan of colonial policy comprehending the Balkan peninsula, the shores of the Mediterranean, and the annexation of Spain with all the Spanish colonies to his system. It is a serious fault that the volume under review does not sufficiently discuss this last point nor recount the French efforts in Argentina. We are utterly at variance with the author in the scant note he gives on page 242. The effect of Trafalgar was to emphasize a fact already patent, the weakness of the French navy. But thereafter not even the slightest diminution of effort for colonial expansion is noticeable. What man could do was done. Even when England seized the last remnants of French colonial empire in the east, Réunion and the Ile de France, Napoleon was undismayed. Spain was intractable but Holland was not: when the latter country became a satellite kingdom of the French empire her splendid colonies likewise entered the French system. Fairly assured of continental peace Napoleon at once turned his attention to his colonies old and new. In May, 1811, an expedition of two frigates and a cor-

vette, with fourteen hundred troops and ample supplies, reached Java in safety. A similar one of equal or greater strength destined for the Ile de France was destroyed by the British about the same time. Six months later the British seized Java; but this fact does not disprove Napoleon's care or concern.

The central truth then is clear: that Napoleon did have a colonial policy comparable to the other great plans which he formed, that he put forth every exertion to carry it out, studying his problems, sparing neither time nor expense in solving them, and generally being deeply concerned to his latest hour with the inter-relations of world politics. It would indeed have been strange if a mind suckled on Raynal's *Two Indies* had belied its earliest manifestations of character and had been false to its whole training.

What then were the causes of Napoleon's colonial failure? The incapacity of Decrès, the minister of naval affairs, and of the naval administration generally, as the supporters of the Napoleonic legend declare? Certainly not; mediocre as those men may have been the imperial spirit permeated naval administration as it permeated every other department of government. Dr. Roloff, we think, finds the true causes: first, in the necessary weakness of French sea-power due to intervals of peace so short that a navy could not be organized and built; secondly, in the fact that European interests were more vital than colonial interests after all and that they must have Napoleon's main attention even though at times he jeopardized them for the sake of colonial empire.

We have already noted one grave fault in the discussion of a very important question: it seems ungracious to complain where so much is excellent. But we remark in closing that the authorities given, not as footnotes, for the taste of readers in Germany as well as here is in revolt against them, but in the appendix, leave something to be desired. Doubtless the author's note-book would confirm every bald reference of "X to Y," date so and so, but in the use of unprinted sources where specific references are made at all the reader may fairly claim a few words of the original. These Dr. Roloff does not give; yet he finds space for eleven pages of text, printing *in extenso* the instructions of the First Consul to Leclerc, a paper the contents of which at least were well known, even though the context was not. This we are glad he has done, but the other he might not have left undone. The writer's style is somewhat jejune but he avoids in the main those labyrinthine involutions which repel foreigners from the reading of German books. The idea of the essay is commendable; so, too, on the whole, is the execution.

Preliminary Stages of the Peace of Amiens. By H. M. BOWMAN.

[University of Toronto Studies, History, Second Series, Vol. I., pp. 77-155.] (Toronto. The University Library. 1899. Pp. 79.)

MR. BOWMAN'S dissertation is a good piece of work. It has endured the criticism of two famous universities, Leipsic and Toronto, and has

been accepted by them as admitting the writer to the guild of historians. It seems needless therefore to say that the materials of his work have been diligently collected from many sources, some of them archival and unpublished, and that he has mastered all of them thoroughly. The course of events and the consequent diplomacy which led up to the peace of Amiens will probably not be better outlined than in these pages until our knowledge is vastly expanded, and of that there is no immediate probability. Two characteristics of the pamphlet seem noteworthy: first, the confirmatory details drawn by the writer from unprinted material in the London Record Office; second, the rather startling confession of his concluding remarks, that it was Great Britain which deliberately broke the peace of Amiens and brought on the Napoleonic wars. Of the former the probable course of negotiations between Great Britain and Austria in 1800 (p. 46) is highly interesting, as indeed are some others. If the latter conclusion had been earlier accepted by the Tory historians of England, pounds of printers' ink and paper would have been saved for other than controversial purposes. Mr. Bowman clearly struggles to hold an even scale and keep himself open to conviction. Justification by the plea of necessity is, however, not always the refuge of ripe scholarship: it certainly does not close the debate. Trafalgar, Leipsic and Waterloo settled many things, but the question of moral responsibility was not among them.

We note one tendency which we consider dangerous. Known writers distinguished for logical exactness may sometimes state conclusions as facts; even they should be very chary in this practice, and others should not indulge in it at all. For example, and this is only one of many that might be quoted, it is a matter of opinion pure and simple what Bonaparte's relations were to the day of Fructidor (p. 14), and this should be stated. As to the perennial question of the invasion of England (p. 17) the reference is utterly misleading, for that was a notorious instance of the ever-recurring use by any and all French governments of such a menace in order to wring money from the public. The First Consul's direct appeal to George III. is represented on page 24 as a breach of English constitutional practice: we fancy the French executive was perfectly clear in his mind that the King of Great Britain ruled as well as reigned. Possibly our caution is not needed, for Mr. Bowman's readers will in the main be the wary ones of his own profession.

Henry Knox. A Soldier of the Revolution. By NOAH BROOKS.
(New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. xvi, 286.)

It is not often that an historical writer of to-day finds so unworked a mine of interesting and valuable biographical matter as Mr. Brooks has exploited in his life of Henry Knox, or one in which the veins of information are so easily accessible. A brief and rare sketch by Francis S. Drake, prepared for the "Memorials for the Massachusetts Society of the Cincinnati," has been hitherto the only, and a very unsatisfactory, memoir

of one of the most prominent and remarkable figures of the Revolution. The highest type of the volunteer general, a self-taught expert in the use of artillery, Washington's right-hand military man throughout all the battles from the siege of Boston to that of Yorktown, the founder of the Society of the Cincinnati, the second Secretary "at War," and one of the leading spirits in the development of what is now the state of Maine—surely so distinguished a patriot as this would long since seem entitled to a painstaking and accurate setting-forth of his character and attainments. This neglect is all the more remarkable in view of the accessibility of the material at Mr. Brooks's disposal. The fifty little-known massive volumes of the Knox Manuscripts, a rich storehouse of information, now in the library of the New England Historic-Genealogical Society, are in themselves almost a complete record of General Knox's life. In addition Mr. Brooks had the use of the Davis collection of Knox papers and the unfinished memoir of Joseph Willard of Boston.

In view of these facilities Mr. Brooks's volume is extremely disappointing. Instead of a scientific and exhaustive biography, we have one stamped with the earmark "popular," in which the copyist has played a large and striking part. Mr. Brooks has chosen to weave the career of General Knox into a brief history of the Revolution with the result of often subordinating his major theme and of adding much matter of little or no value to the reader desirous of getting a clear picture of the subject of the book. For instance, on page 68, the excuse for a description of the Bushnell torpedo is Mr. Brooks's opinion that this invention "doubtless engaged" General Knox's attention. There is no critical estimate of the worth of the General's military services and many important parts of his career such as his relationship to western military matters during his term as Secretary of War (1785-1794) are but insufficiently treated or ignored. While destined to find a place in many libraries, because of the absence of any other life of Knox, Mr. Brooks's narrative by no means says the last word on the subject and need deter no one from setting forth this interesting personality afresh. The book's poor index and its scanty reference to sources (there are none at all to the Knox manuscript volumes so copiously drawn from) will render it of still less value to the student.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD.

The Writings of James Monroe. Edited by STANISLAUS MURRAY HAMILTON. Vol. III., 1796-1802. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. xx, 457.)

THIS volume contains more that is new than either of its predecessors. Some of the letters, belonging to the year 1796, have been printed already, either in the *American State Papers* or in Monroe's *View* or in both; and Mr. Hamilton reprints in an appendix the text of the *View*. The rest of the letters are mostly fresh matter. Most of them come from the Monroe Papers, or those of Jefferson and Madison, in the possession

of the Department of State. A few are derived from the George Clinton Papers at Albany. A much larger number are taken from the executive letter-books in the office of the secretary of state of Virginia, being official letters of Monroe during his term of office as governor of that state, December 1799 to December 1802. The texts are in general good. We notice, p. 124, "Purriane's trip to London," for "Purviance's;" p. 134, "rush Mr. A. (Adams) to an explanation," for "push;" p. 160, "Carolina," for "Caroline" (County, Virginia); p. 192, "whether the common law is in form under the Federal Constitution," for "in force;" p. 354, "as" twice for "or." These are, under their respective circumstances, rather serious slips; but they are not numerous.

In the first part of the volume we have the last letters of Monroe to Secretary Pickering, and other papers relating to his first venture into the fields of diplomacy. To the present reviewer they seem to show slender abilities in diplomacy, and remarkable zeal in self-exculpation. Monroe was still highly self-conscious. Four years after his return, writing to one who had been his friend in Paris, he says (p. 265): "I can never look back on what occurred during a certain portion of my life without having my feelings peculiarly excited." The reader who hoped that the correspondence with Jefferson and Madison in the volume would cast interesting and important lights on the development of the Republican party in Virginia and the stirring events of 1798 will be disappointed. Throughout that year Monroe was still too full of his own grievances to pay much attention to those things. At the end of the next year he was elected governor of his native state, and half the present volume is devoted to the letters which he wrote while he held that office. The most interesting event of his three-years' term was the servile outbreak known as Gabriel's Insurrection, the history of which is fully illustrated by these pages. It caused a serious effort on the part of the Virginian legislature and executive toward mitigating the dangers arising from so numerous a negro population by deporting a part of the surplus, and especially the most dangerous portion. In accordance with a legislative resolution, application was made to the President of the United States, with a suggestion that western lands might be ceded for the purpose. This proving open to objections readily occurring to Mr. Jefferson, he suggested, among other expedients, arrangements with the British government for deportation to Sierra Leone. This correspondence, some of which has already been printed in Kennedy's *Report* on colonization, led indirectly, through the efforts of Gen. Charles Fenton Mercer in 1816, to the foundation of the American Colonization Society.

Other matters of interest are: letters respecting Callender, and Jefferson's relations to him; letters regarding the Virginian armory; a letter to Genet, written in 1800, in which Monroe says, "I considered it my duty not to injure your fame or detract from your merit while I was in France," etc.; and letters showing the anxiety of the executive of Virginia, and the precautionary measures taken by him, during the uncertainty as to the election of Jefferson at the federal capitol. That town,

by the way, is to Monroe, almost to the end of the period in question, "the federal town" or "the federal city." It is not till February 1801 that he can bring himself to call it the City of Washington. More than usual interest attaches to his annual communications to the Virginia legislature.

On the whole, the volume is not filled with remarkable things. It will not dissipate the impression that Monroe was a somewhat dull man; George Long, it will perhaps be remembered, thought him excessively so. And if a whole volume is devoted to this quiet period of his life, the number of volumes to which the whole series must extend will be much greater than was expected, unless subsequent and highly important periods are disposed of with disproportionate haste.

A History of the People of the United States, from the Revolution to the Civil War. By JOHN BACH McMASTER. Vol. V., 1821-1830. (New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1900. Pp. xiv, 577.)

THIS volume of Professor McMaster's masterpiece is in many respects unusually true to the peculiar promise of the title of the work. The period under inspection is that of Monroe's second term of office and of John Quincy Adams's administration with the introductory year of Jackson's reign. But, as in the preceding volume of the work the author has discussed the causes which led to the final rupture between the two wings of the Democratic-Republican party, he needs here to chronicle only the catastrophe. Out of fourteen chapters of the book before us, only six are devoted to the affairs of national politics and of the central administration. These six chapters are divided between the beginning and the end of the book and made to serve as covers to the body of the work, which is devoted to the consideration of sundry phases in the social and industrial evolution of the people of the United States. The first three chapters in the book contain, therefore, a summary of the important political and diplomatic events during Monroe's second term of office. In the first two chapters are presented the efforts for the suppression of the slave trade, the perilous controversies about the boundary in Texas and Oregon, and all the incidents and movements in Europe and South America which preceded and followed the declaration of the so-called Monroe Doctrine. The third chapter is entirely filled with the story of the presidential election of 1824, in the heat of which collision the crystallization of new parties began.

At the close of the book we find three more chapters in which the same subjects reappear, at the risk of some repetitions, which perhaps were inevitable after such an interval. Chapter LI. is devoted to the foreign policy of the Adams administration. It continues from Chapter XI. the discussion of our negotiations with England concerning the boundaries of Maine and Oregon and shows the unfriendly relations of the two countries over the West Indian trade. The statement of the varying phases of the boundary controversy during those years is admirably lucid,

and is illustrated by a map of Maine and the Maritime Provinces for the year 1830. The remainder of the chapter is filled with the story of the fiasco of the Panama Congress, showing all the threads of South American politics that were spun about that mortifying failure. The final paragraphs in Chapter XLI. about the support of the Latin-American republics against the Holy Alliance are substantially repeated (pp. 52-54, 438-440). The Central and South American republics would probably have secured the independence of both Cuba and Porto Rico at that time if our government had not feared to see the resultant establishment of a free negro population so near to our shores. It was due to slavery in the United States that Spanish misgovernment in the Antilles was endowed with a new lease of life. The slave power here bore to Spanish rule in America the same relation that Russia bears to Persia, at once its best friend and its worst foe, defending it against all attacks but its own. When slavery in the United States was overthrown, the Spanish authority in the Antilles was no less certainly doomed than that of the French in Mexico. It was interesting that the doom of the former should follow closely enough upon the heels of the latter to permit men who had been Confederate generals to become the agents of destiny. The author dismisses the magnificent visions and scanty realizations of the Adams administration with this view of foreign relations only, and passes on in Chapter LII. to the "bargain and corruption" cry against Adams and Clay which had already been partially examined in Chapter XLII. In the concluding chapter of the book (LIII.), the reader is introduced to the new heavens and new earth of Jackson's first administration, and the volume ends abruptly, in the midst of the mutterings of southern Democrats, in 1829, against the tariff.

Turning now to the eight chapters that compose the real substance of this volume, we pass at once from diplomatic conferences and congressional politics to a series of essays upon different aspects of the popular development during the generation prior to 1830. The author himself has provided a review of this part of his work in the following single sentence (p. 488), somewhat characteristically minute and unwontedly clumsy: "An attempt has been made to describe the life of the people in the cities, in the towns and villages, on the frontier; their ideas on government, on banking, on labor, on education, on literature, on the social problems of the time, have been reviewed; the astonishing betterment in the conditions of life brought about by new inventions and discoveries, new means of locomotion and the rise of new industries and new ways of gaining a livelihood, have all been described, and it is now time to turn, etc."

Under the topic "Socialistic and Labor Reforms" Professor McMaster groups together, first, a review of workingmen's parties in Philadelphia and New York City from 1791 to 1829; secondly, a description of the Owenite paradise at New Harmony, Indiana, where Robert Owen's enthusiastic disciple, William Maclure, awaited the time when he should see "foxes peering out of the windows of the crumbling buildings of

Philadelphia ;" thirdly, a lively sketch of the vagaries of Fanny Wright, and, finally, the origins of the anti-Masonic party in New York. The story of Morgan and anti-Masonry is out of place in such a chapter, for anti-Masonry was not socialistic or industrial in character. Anti-Masonry should find a place in the analysis of the political forces that made up the Adams or National Republican party, or in the story of the origins of the Whig party.

In a chapter entitled "The State of the Country from 1825 to 1829," the development of municipal government, trade and commerce is considered chiefly with reference to New York and Philadelphia, and then the story of coal-mines, canals, and pike-roads leads naturally to the ever interesting account of the social and industrial conditions in the Ohio and Mississippi valleys. The only defect in this sketch is its brevity. This making of a nation out of chaos is exactly what Professor McMaster started to depict and exactly what his readers want to see. He paints these pictures with a spirit that shows his powers of description at their best and fortunately he enjoys a ready sympathy for the abundant humors of the processes of social creation.

When John Reynolds held his first court among the people who were his old neighbors, the sheriff sat astride of a bench and opened court with the words, "Boys, the Court is now open. John is on the bench."

"Judge," said the foreman of a hung jury, "this is the difficulty: the jury want to know whether what you told us when we first went out really was the law, or whether it was only just your notion."

"On one occasion the treasurer of the State of Illinois, after a protracted struggle in the Legislature, failed of re-election. But the vote had scarcely been counted when he entered the chamber, took off his coat, and soundly thrashed, one by one, four men who had voted against him. Both friends and opponents considered this as no more than the occasion required, and he was promptly made Clerk of the Circuit Court."

In Chapter XLV. "The Negro Problem" introduces the American Colonization Society, founded in 1816, followed by the story of early abolition societies, the career of Benjamin Lundy and the enlistment of William Lloyd Garrison in the anti-slavery cause. Out of 101 anti-slavery societies existing in 1826, 77 were in the slaveholding border states. The fact that nearly 1000 Abolition votes were cast in the city of Baltimore, presumably chiefly by Quakers, explains why Lundy and Garrison chose to work in that city.

"The Industrial Revolution" is the name given to the history of the rise and triumph of protectionist sentiment in the tariffs of 1824 and 1828. Two chapters are assigned to the literary history of the period. One chapter is almost entirely filled with the diatribes against us that appeared in the English quarterly reviews from 1814 to 1828, surely a disproportionate allotment of space in Professor McMaster's work, even if the readers of those reviews did not make a similar complaint. Some of the jibes of the Britons are justified by the extraordinary announcement of a Boston contemporary of the Quarterly, called *The Emerald*.

Its editors hoped that it "would be polished by the labors of the learned, and occasionally glitter with the gayety of wit, and would be found worthy to shine among the gems which sparkle on the regalia of literature."

Another topic is "The Common School in the First Half-Century," an outline of history beginning with an act of the Massachusetts General Court in 1647, and then confining itself mainly to the development of schools in New York and Pennsylvania and to the land-grants and other efforts in behalf of education in the south and west.

"Political Ideas in the First Half-Century" is the subject of the last essay in the series. The crop of new state constitutions that sprang up in the path of the Jeffersonian revolution is examined with reference to the gradual disappearance of religious and property qualifications upon the suffrage. The historian does not, however, do justice to the close relation between these political notions and the religious and social contentions which embittered political feeling, especially in New England. Other prevalent ideas were the general reluctance to concede the right of courts to annul laws by declaring them unconstitutional, the widespread desire to define more clearly the limitations upon executive power, and the fear that the expansion of the country would involve it in ruin. When Louisiana, a territory outside the original boundary of the United States, was an applicant for admission to the Union (1812), Josiah Quincy voiced the apprehensions of New England in words that have a familiar sound: "You have no right to throw the liberties and property of this people into hotch-potch with the wild men on the Missouri, nor with the mixed though more respectable race of Anglo-Hispano-Gallo-Americans who bask on the sands at the mouth of the Mississippi. Do you suppose the people of the Northern and Atlantic States will or ought to look with patience and see representatives and senators from the Red River and Missouri pouring themselves on this and the other floor, managing the affairs of a seaboard 1500 miles at least from their residence?" Twenty New England members voted "No."

These somewhat disconnected studies, excellent as they all are, leave something to be desired in historical perspective as well as in symmetry of arrangement. In the review of events that contributed to popular progress there is no sacrifice of clearness or interest. The style is terse, the perception of the human interest is acute, the argument or narrative is straightforward, logical and accurate. And yet, sometimes, the author seems to lack that large firm grasp of relations which should unite the different parts of the story for a common purpose. The dramatic sense that is needed in order to make the whole story impressive is not often perceptible in these pages, and while the author may gain thereby in sanity he may lose somewhat in force. If he must give as much attention to political history as he seems to think, one might wish for a keener analysis of the political and social reactions that precipitated, out of the Jeffersonian elements, here an Adams party and there a Jackson party. There are signs that Professor McMaster is becoming more liberal in his

allowance for the influence that strong personalities exert upon the popular mind—of which they are at once the expression and the guide. He writes, as has already been observed, with especial attention to affairs in New York and Pennsylvania, and yet this volume, which covers the time of the final triumphs and vicissitudes of DeWitt Clinton, contains no adequate study of that once-potent leader, of his influence upon national politics, or of the political affiliations of his enthusiastic following. In fact the history of our people in their political life between 1824 and 1830 is little more than a study of the power of rival personalities, an unequaled group of contemporary leaders, Jackson, Van Buren, Crawford, Randolph, Clay, Adams, Clinton, Webster and Calhoun. It is still true that no one will turn to Professor McMaster's book in order to find an adequate estimate of the influence that these men exerted during this period among our people and upon the development of political ideas and parties. Perhaps, too, it would have been well to shorten some of the abstracts of magazine articles, pamphlets and Congressional debates and to enlarge more upon the extraordinary results of the temperance agitation which spread rapidly in New England after 1824.

This volume contains five maps. The most interesting is a reproduction of a map of Texas made in Cincinnati in 1836, which shows the territorial grants made by the Mexican government up to that time. On page 417, line 19, it is evident that some word has been omitted. The title-page now announces that the whole work will occupy seven, instead of six volumes, a welcome change, and it would seem that eight would be none too many, if the present rate of progress is retained. The development of the people during the decades 1830 to 1850 is a more fruitful topic than any that Professor McMaster has yet discussed, and it is to be hoped that he will not hurry over it.

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

Theodore Parker, Preacher and Reformer. By JOHN WHITE CHADWICK. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1900. Pp. xx, 422.)

IN a notice of Weiss's *Life of Parker*, written for the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1864, I said that for the then existing generation Parker must be interpreted by one of the family—by one spiritually related to him, if not bound by the feebler tie of blood. While the accents of the great preacher yet lingered in the Boston Music Hall, he was no subject for complacent literary speculation or calm judicial discourse. More than the thirty years allotted to a generation have passed, and there reaches us a life of Parker by one spiritually related to him indeed, yet capable of a valuation of the man and his work that leaves little to be desired. This new life takes its place, not only as an admirable introduction to the fuller biographies of Weiss and Frothingham, but as a generally satisfactory estimate of what its subject was and was not—of his immense accomplishment and of the defects that limited his gigantic manhood.

Mr. Chadwick is aware how far from judicial were the occasional pulpit utterances of the preacher, how removed from charity were expressions printed in his private correspondence. No defence can be made of the description (in a letter to Dr. Francis) of certain Unitarian ministers—men of gracious and useful lives—in terms that might have been permitted to Savonarola in a characterization of Alexander VI. But the best of us write carelessly to friends who will sprinkle our hasty sentences with the proverbial grains of salt, and so we are ready to accept the biographer's kindly generalization that Parker "*thought in persons* and could with difficulty separate the opinion from the man." Yet every reader will not agree with Mr. Chadwick that the liberal ministers were wrong in desiring Parker's withdrawal from their body since it stood for free inquiry and free utterance. But how if this same free inquiry had led one of their associates to return to the worship of Minerva or to accept the inspired leadership of Joseph Smith? And the leap from the authority of a revelation to what the most kindly of their number had called "the new gospel of a shallow naturalism" seemed scarcely less momentous. Parker never made allowance for the fact that his own jubilant assurance of a divine parent full of tenderness for men could not be shared by all who ceased to base this belief upon a scriptural record. Yet Mill, Parker's peer in intelligence and in devotion to the service of his fellows, could discover no more than a possible deity of limited powers, and Tennyson—far from observing that "the Almighty takes such bounteous care of all little things that no animal can be found all of whose wants are not perfectly satisfied"—heard through the raven of the lower creation, a shriek of protest against the creeds of men. It must also be remembered that he who found only empty bluster in the Southern threat of secession might be over-bitter in criticism of neighbors who believed what the event afterwards proved, and who regarded the maintenance of the Union a fundamental condition of human progress.

* The complementary qualities that make for the improvement of man's condition must find embodiment in different individuals. It is fortunate when one of these qualities, calling for change in the conception of the religious life, is so robustly represented as in Parker. Of the books that bring the fearless preacher before another generation, Mr. Chadwick's—though not the most voluminous—is easily the best. It is fortunate that, owing to his early death, Parker left friends so able to do justice to the spirit that was in him. We are shown the scholar as a persistent truth-seeker, the minister "never engaged in the attempt to make his inherited opinions plausible and satisfactory," the sternest censor of his time overshadowed by a nature full of love and sympathy. This "transcendentalist with an inductive attachment" supplied the missing link between the serene philosophy of Concord and the persistent push of physical science. He stood before his people as one whose convictions were contagious, whose words could rivet the attention of the drowsiest church-goer.

Without this man the history of Boston would be less worthy than it is ; and his uplifting influence reached far over the nation and beyond the sea.

J. P. QUINCY.

A Life of Francis Parkman. By CHARLES HAIGHT FARNHAM. (Boston : Little, Brown, and Company. 1900. Pp. xv, 394.)

AT first glance, Mr. Farnham's *Life of Francis Parkman* must be disturbing to those who knew how slight was Parkman's patience with the vagaries of New England philosophy. When in the authorized biography of such a man you find a whole section devoted to what the table of contents calls his "spiritual growth," and when this section is formally preceded by others on the man "as seen in his works," and on his "preparation," you half dread to read, fearing lest you shall find the outlines of an heroic life weakened and distorted by sentimentality. This superficial aspect of Mr. Farnham's book deserves remark, because its very superficiality makes it salient. In truth it is almost the only fault of a work which should come to be recognized as a masterpiece of literary portraiture.

The merit of this work is the more unusual if, as the terms of its plan suggest, Mr. Farnham is temperamentally disposed to sympathize with Transcendentalism, and with Reform, and with whatever else tended romantically and ardently to disintegrate that sturdy old New England in whose later days Parkman found his own sympathies increasingly conservative. But, after all, Mr. Farnham shows qualities which could counterbalance any temperamental bias. In the first place, he has an exceptional power of placing himself in cordial sympathy with his immediate subject ; in the second, he has a still more exceptional power of seeking only to perceive the truth and to set it forth truthfully. From this results a style at once unobtrusive and efficient. You are rarely aware of Mr. Farnham's phrasing ; you are never at a loss to understand what he means. From beginning to end of his book you are in the presence of the remarkable personality which this work will keep alive for those who care to know it.

The vividness of Mr. Farnham's portrait any one must feel. To appreciate its fidelity one must perhaps have had the happiness to know Parkman with some approach to familiarity. Except in its more personal aspects his life was uneventful. Its incidents were only those of a ceaseless struggle with physical and mental obstacles which would have proved fatal to almost any courage but his. The historical work which he accomplished every one knows. What can truly be known only to the comparatively few who chanced to meet him in his later years is the strong, uncompromising, unmistakable individuality of his character. Amid the same persistent braveries which brought into being the masterpieces of our historical literature, this grew to its ripeness. One's memory of Parkman can never be confused with any other ; it is at once human and heroic, affectionate and inspiring. Above all, it is distinct and ineffaceable.

The deepest merit of Mr. Farnham's book, then, is one which only those who knew and cared for Parkman can fully understand. Without violation of that fine reticence which was so deeply inbred in Parkman, Mr. Farnham has given us an unfaltering study of his personality. As you read it, you feel a growing sense that you are once more in the presence of the man, in his habit, as he lived. The hours which you pass with this book are like renewed ones with the friend whose memory it will help to preserve. You lay it down with a feeling of grave, tender content. The future, if it will, may know more than Parkman's work; it may know Parkman, too.

BARRETT WENDELL.

A History of Banking in the United States. By the late JOHN JAY KNOX, assisted by a corps of financial writers in the various States. The entire work carefully revised and brought up to date by BRADFORD RHODES, editor of the *Bankers' Magazine*, and ELMER H. YOUNGMAN, associate editor. (New York: Bradford Rhodes and Co. 1900. Pp. xxii, 880.)

THE academic world of patient investigation and reflective analysis as well as the more active world of political administration and finance has been greatly indebted in the past to Mr. Knox for his contributions to the history of government monetary issues and banking institutions,—contributions characterized by careful inquiry, candid spirit and lucid statement. Mr. Knox was Deputy Comptroller and Comptroller of the Currency from 1867 to 1884, during which period the national banking system was fiercely assailed. Thus he enjoyed abundant opportunities for acquiring information not only through the archives of the office, but also through a large and intimate acquaintance with bankers throughout the country. During this long period of service, he set a praiseworthy example as a government official, in incorporating into his annual reports the results of historical research. He thus made his documents of permanent value to the student. The reports of 1875 and 1876 are notable illustrations. The researches of Mr. Knox led him in two directions,—one into the history of government treasury notes, and the other into that of the origin and development of banking institutions in the United States. The results of the first of these studies were published in 1884 in the volume entitled *United States Notes*. That book met with general approval, and has since passed through several editions. Although compact in its compass, it contains the essential facts, and presents them in a style appropriate to the scheme adopted by the author. The second task Mr. Knox did not live to complete. It was far more difficult to accomplish than the former, for it demanded a separate banking study for each of the states; and as there has been a great variety of systems with no uniform development, and as in many cases there are few public documents which can be relied upon for information, the gathering of the material was naturally slow and perplexing. Mr. Knox left

the government service in 1884, and from that time until his death in 1892 was actively engaged in the banking business in New York. The opportunities for continuous inquiry were consequently broken, although the historical interest still remained.

The editor's preface states that Mr. Knox substantially finished his study relating to national banks, and accumulated a large part of the facts desired for treating of state banks, "but did not live to finish what he regarded as one of the most important undertakings of his life." The completion of the work was then put into the hands of the editors of Rhodes's *Journal of Banking* to which Mr. Knox from time to time had contributed a series of studies. These editors in turn called into co-operation a large number of assistants from different states to amplify the local studies. Acknowledgment is also made of the assistance rendered by Mr. William B. Greene, for many years in the Comptroller's office, and familiar with the plans of Mr. Knox. The result of the labors of these various editors, contributors, and advisers, is the work now before us,—a large volume of nearly nine hundred pages. Like all others prepared under such circumstances it is in many ways unsatisfactory. It is a compilation rather than a well-digested treatise; and judged even as a compilation, it is open to objection because of the repetitions. Nevertheless when account is taken of the conditions controlling the production of the work, the public is largely debarred from criticism and should be thankful for what is given.

There are two ways in which the history of banking may be studied,—one relates to the machinery of banking, the laws controlling the incorporation and the management of banks, with an account of the political relationships thus developed, and a description of the various technical processes by which the bank carries on its operations; the other relates to the social and economic influence of banks upon the general life of the people.

Most of the banking studies thus far made will be found in the first class, and this work is no exception. It is a record of annals,—dates, names, events and summaries of laws,—rather than an historical narrative which takes into account the forces shaping the development of banks and the consequences to the people in benefits or evils. The merit of this particular work is that it presents these annals in a more compendious and detailed form than can be found in any other volume.

Part I., pp. 1-304, is directed to the history of banks operating under federal laws, including the Bank of North America, the First and Second United States Banks, and the national banks. For this earlier portion the treatment does not disclose any new or wide research, or even familiarity with the detailed labors of Professor Sumner as witnessed in *The Financier and Finances of the American Revolution*, and the life of Andrew Jackson. Occasionally there is an interesting expression of judgment in regard to men and the course of events. The author believes that if a bank had been established in 1775, it would have resulted in ample financial resources which would have given to Congress greater authority

and diminished that of the states. In this way a strong and centralized government might have been more quickly brought about. The First United States Bank is termed a great monopoly, useful no doubt, but a foreign importation and as a monopoly opposed to the genius of American institutions; the removal of the deposits by Jackson and the issue of the specie circular were acts of financial recklessness; and Tyler is characterized as narrow and mediocre.

The chapters on the national banking system are naturally the best in the book. Mr. Knox clearly appreciated the fundamental significance of the long continued struggle after the Civil War to substitute treasury notes in place of bank notes, and more than this, understood the administration influences which in unsuspected ways contributed to the support of the greenback in its rivalry with the bank notes.

"With legal tender notes, the Treasurer's office, which had charge of the preparation, signing, issuing and redemption of these notes, gradually acquired more power. The Treasurer was a much more important official with greatly increased patronage. The handling of the United States notes caused him to be in more frequent consultation with the Secretary. The office of the Comptroller of the Currency did not tend to establish so close relations. In fact, there were from a very early day two factions in the Treasury Department, the legal tender faction and the national bank faction. The former, whenever they had opportunity, did what they could to prevent the retirement of legal tender notes and the substitution therefor of national bank currency. Many of the most effective arguments against the banks were furnished to members of Congress from this source" (p. 149).

Part II. of the work treats of banking under state laws. The history of each state is taken up separately, there being no attempt to bring these several local experiences into one comprehensive survey or series of generalizations. The data will be serviceable to the future historian, but this portion as it now stands is of little interest as a narrative. Use has been made of the *Sound Currency Monographs* issued by the Reform Club of New York. This material will supplement the volume on United States banking prepared by Professor Sumner for the encyclopedic history of banking in all countries.

The following errors have been noted: The date 1781, on page 39, should be 1791; Woodbury was not Secretary of the Treasury in 1833, as mentioned on page 70, but Secretary of the Navy; Boutelle is written for Boutwell, on page 149; Jurdan for Jordan, on page 222; the date on page 96, January 8, 1863, should be changed to 1862; and on page 125, the dollar sign has slipped in before the figures 6, 505, 930. The most serious error, however, is the confusion occasioned by Chapters 14-16 on the national banking system, which repeat much of what appears in previous chapters. The reader would have a more correct understanding if this matter had been incorporated into the main narrative.

DAVIS RICH DEWEY.

A History of Tennessee from 1663 to 1900 for Use in Schools. By G. R. McGEE, Principal of College Street School, Jackson, Tennessee. (New York: The American Book Company. Pp. xxxix, 238.)

History of Tennessee, its People and its Institutions. By WILLIAM ROBERTSON GARRETT, A.M., Ph.D., Professor of American History in Peabody Normal College, and ALBERT VIRGIL GOODPASTURE, A.M., formerly Clerk of the Supreme Court of Tennessee. (Nashville: Brandon Printing Company. Pp. 350.)

THE first permanent settlement in the present state of Tennessee was made in the valley of the Watauga, a branch of the Holston River, in 1769, and ten years later the Cumberland settlements on the present site of Nashville were started. In 1790 the territory west of the ridge of the Smoky Mountains was deeded by North Carolina to the national government and was organized as the "Territory South of the River Ohio." The first territorial legislature under the terms of the cession (the Northwest Ordinance without the anti-slavery section) sat in 1794, and two years later the people organized themselves into the state of Tennessee and demanded admission into the union of states as a right under the compact of cession.

The constitution of 1796 contained several peculiarities characteristic of the period and of local conditions. All power of administration, legislation and legal procedure was placed in the hands or under the control of the governor and legislature, and they were held accountable to the people by biennial popular elections for the management of their trusts. The general, and most local, officers, including the judges, were their appointees. Land, polls and stud horses were the only objects taxed by the constitution: no 100-acre parcel to be taxed more than any other, and no town lot or free poll more than 100 acres; slave polls at twice the rate of free polls. As time went on the democratizing movement affected Tennessee. Land also differentiated more in value, the land speculators lost in influence, and personal property increased in relative importance. The constitution of 1834 made most of the officials, local and general, elective, and readjusted the basis of taxation in harmony with the economic conditions. In 1853 an amendment made even the Supreme Court judges subject to popular election for terms of eight years, and the constitution of 1870 made "all" property taxable at its value.

After 1825, at latest, state politics were dominated by national. But internal improvements and state charitable institutions were fostered. Especially in respect of the latter the state was very progressive.

The state refused to secede, in January, 1861, and only withdrew after Lincoln's call for troops. It was one of the great battle-grounds of the Civil War. It was also the first in which military government was set up (1862), and it was therefore excepted from the Emancipation Proclamation. It abolished slavery in 1865, and in 1866 its senators

and representatives were allowed to resume their seats in Congress. Thus Tennessee was the first of the seceding states to be recognized by all three departments of the national government and escaped congressional reconstruction and carpet-bag rule. But the animosities of its citizens were bitter enough. In 1870, by the connivance of Governor Senter, who sought re-election, a majority of the male citizens of full age voted, and thus the democrats were returned to power.

Both of the books named above have been published for use in the schools of Tennessee. McGee's book is addressed "To the Girls and Boys of Tennessee" and, allowing for its limited scope and purpose, is almost above criticism. In many difficult passages, in the one treating of Governor Senter's re-election among others, the author displays historical abilities worthier of a larger scope and a more critical audience. His account of the Tennessee Centennial Exposition held in 1897 to celebrate the completion of 100 years of statehood is, however, undignified and silly. Two features of that exposition which were especially successful and distinctive were the display of the raw products of the South, from field, forest and mine, and the architecture. The Art Building was an exact reproduction of the Parthenon in external form, size, and decorations, and all the chief buildings were in either the pure Greek or the colonial style, formerly so much used in the south.

The other book, though immediately designed for use in the higher grades, in compliance with the new text-book law, is in places more pretentious than a text-book and deserves consideration on more general grounds. It is a brief but compendious history of the state, containing the best that is to be found in Haywood, Ramsey and Phelan, correcting errors, exploding myths, and adding fresh material. The statements of fact are reliable, and the authors have shown great diligence in collecting them. The most valuable contributions are the chapters on the Indian treaties and land cessions, with new maps drawn from the data. These are subjects on which the authors are specialists.

There is so much action in the early period that the narrative seldom fails to be interesting. But chapter after chapter in the period after 1815 is a mere chronicle of events and series of biographical sketches. The authors lack literary finish, historical perspective, power of generalization and power of interpretation. The mutiny of the Tennessee troops in the Creek campaign (Fort Strother, Alabama, December, 1813) is rhetorically attributed to deficient "fortitude." In fact it was due to the faulty militia system of defense against the Indians, a system which deserved full discussion. General Jackson is praised for the spectacular events of January 8, 1815, and nothing is said of his memorable display of military genius by the attack of December 23, 1814. It would take a Cuvier to reconstruct from the dry bones of constitutional change scattered through the book any semblance to the organic development which actually took place from 1796 to 1870. Internal improvements which the constitution of 1834 was designed to promote, are treated of towards the close of the book in a chapter entitled: "The Constitution of 1870 Prohibits

State Aid to Internal Improvements."¹¹ The encroachment of national politics into state affairs, especially under Jackson's influence, is noted as a fact. But the similar experience of other states is not adverted to, nor is its inevitableness discussed, nor the dwarfing effect upon state politics, nor the consolidating effect, through the aggrandizement of national at the expense of state interests; all of them legitimate questions, and pertinent, as showing the practical effect of our peculiar double system upon the relative spheres and reciprocal relations of the state and the national governments.

Most of the episodes of Tennessee history are not peculiar to her alone. They have their local details and coloring. They may have been more intense in Tennessee than in other states, or less so. But they were mere parts of broad movements, and it would have added greatly to the value of this book for every purpose if more attention had been paid to the fact. The second edition, it is understood, will be printed from revised plates.

FREDERICK W. MOORE.

Pausanias and other Greek Sketches, by J. G. Frazer. (Macmillan, pp. x, 419.) This attractive little volume contains first—as Mr. Frazer states in his preface—a reprint of that chapter upon Pausanias which served as an introduction to his voluminous and scholarly commentary upon that author. This is published without change, save the omission of the numerous footnotes which accompany the commentary. The essay upon Pericles is reprinted in the same way from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. The other sketches are extracts, in whole or in part, from the commentary. The greater part of these are descriptions of those places mentioned by Pausanias, and of the routes over which he journeyed. In a few instances accounts are given of places not visited by the ancient traveller, but well worth the attention of those who would follow in his footsteps. Some of the sketches are almost entirely rewritten,—that on the Lernaean Marsh, p. 266, and that on the road to Olympia, p. 287; others are published without change. As parts of Mr. Frazer's commentary upon the travels of Pausanias these descriptions add a needed touch of local color and of present interest to his account of the antiquarian and religious side of Greek life. Separately printed they will prove a welcome addition to the sources of information at the disposition of the modern traveller in Greece, while the admirable literary quality of the book will commend it to a larger audience.

Rome: Its Rise and Fall. A Text-book for High Schools and Colleges, by P. V. N. MYERS, L.H.D. (Boston, Ginn, pp. xii, 554). This new history of Rome—an expansion of a smaller work by the same author—has all of Mr. Myers's characteristic merits. The style is simple, lively, and on the whole, clear; the book contains abundance of anecdote and of other illustrative matter. The author aims, too, to show the significance of events, and introduces many instructive analogies from modern

history and government. With its bibliographies, maps, and pictures, the work is pedagogically admirable; in brief, it is probably as teachable as anything Mr. Myers has written.

Unfortunately, however, we have a different story to tell of its accuracy. Probably no other elementary history of Rome in existence is so thoroughly untrustworthy from beginning to end. A large class of the misconceptions and errors it contains are due to the author's ignorance of recent progress in the study of Roman history and to his inability to discriminate between good and poor authority. In his treatment of primitive Rome, for instance, he tries to follow Mommsen's *History of Rome*; but had he wished to learn Mommsen's later and more reasonable views, he should have read the *Staatsrecht*. For the earliest institutions of Rome, however, Eduard Meyer is far superior to Mommsen, while the soundest principles of criticism must now be learned from Herzog. But if the maker of a text-book is to be excused from consulting such authorities, at least he might learn from Pelham that the Roman *curiae* contained plebeians and clients as well as patricians. The artificial and absolutely groundless theory that in the beginning the citizens were exclusively patrician distorts all the early history of Rome. Again, Mr. Myers fills the fifth century B. C. with agrarian agitation, whereas in fact the trouble over the disposition of acquired land could not have begun before the fourth century. From these instances it will be seen that the author's misconceptions involve not isolated points merely, but whole periods and long continued developments.

Another large class of errors, due to sheer carelessness, might have been avoided by consulting the most ordinary text-book on the subject. Mr. Myers tells us, for example, that the *comitium* was a platform and the *rostra* a desk, that the Latin League was "re-established" in 493 B. C., and that the Valerian-Horatian Laws, passed in 449 B. C., instituted the "military quaestorship!" Blunders equally absurd occur on nearly every page; on some pages the reader may search in vain for a correct statement. Considering how widely this text-book will probably be used, ought we not to pity the great number of boys and girls who will be taught to look upon such nonsense as Roman history?

G. W. B.

Part XXVII. of Dr. R. L. Poole's *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe* (Clarendon Press) contains a map of Europe at the accession of Charles V., with letter-press by Mr. C. Oman, in which the rivalry between the Ottoman Empire and that of Charles is strongly emphasized; one by the editor, of England and Wales, showing the parliamentary representation according to the Reform Act of 1832; and one by Miss Lina Eckenstein, of Italy from about 1060 to 1167. The atlas approaches its conclusion.

Source-Book of English History, edited by Elizabeth Kimball Kendall, Associate Professor of History of Wellesley College. (Macmillan, pp. xxii, 483.) Miss Kendall's book is intended for the use of boys and girls of about sixteen. It does not attempt to illustrate English his-

tory continuously, but deals avowedly with selected periods. Twenty-two epochs are thus treated, beginning with the Britons and Saxons and coming down to the modern Empire. In the early part of the book one is disposed to cavil somewhat at the sense of proportion which gave to the Hundred Years' War more illustrative material than was thought necessary for the constitutional struggles of the preceding century. The Wars of the Roses are similarly magnified into undue importance. The Tudor and Puritan periods are treated with some fulness, and the selections are well-chosen. They are almost entirely of a descriptive sort. The only statutory material for the Tudor period is a law against the keeping of sheep, 1534. Among other interesting selections are quotations from the reports of the Venetian ambassador, Giacomo Soranzo, a news-letter to Wentworth, letters of Charles I. to Strafford, an extract from Lord Ashley's report on child-labor, and Mrs. Harris's description of the Indian mutiny at Lucknow.

The nineteenth century is treated at greatest length, having over a hundred pages given it out of 465. Miss Kendall justifies this on the ground "of the great difficulty in gaining access to the original materials of the last three centuries."

The make-up of the book is satisfactory save as respects the marginal annotations, which confuse notices of authors and authorities quoted with comments upon the text. There is a good index in which the names of authors are accented.

Source-Book of English History, by Guy Carleton Lee, Ph.D. (Henry Holt and Co., pp. 585.) This book is, for the main part, a repository of good material, well-selected. Part I. is a bibliography of sources, covering some 60 pages, and deserving especial mention because such lists might well be included in the prevalent source-book, and, as a rule, are not. The remaining 520 pages contain a varied collection of documents and extracts, which are rather institutional and legal than descriptive. The text of many important documents and statutes is given in full. Among these, one may mention the Constitutions of Clarendon, Magna Charta, the Statute of Praemunire, the Statute of Laborers, the Instrument of Government, and the Habeas Corpus Act. This is material the lack of which has been felt in similar compilations. The last 80 pages, dealing with the nineteenth century, are open to the objection of being largely taken from secondary material. This is at once unscholarly and unnecessary. Molesworth's *History of the Reform*, Gammage's *History of the Chartist Movement*, and Levi's *History of British Commerce* cannot be classed as sources, and it is not apparent why extracts from these and similar works are included in Mr. Lee's collection.

The Cely Papers; Selections from the Correspondence and Memoranda of the Cely Family, Merchants of the Staple, A. D. 1475-1488. Edited for the Royal Historical Society by Henry Elliot Malden (Longmans, pp. liii, 214). Inevitably the comparison of the Paston Letters suggests itself in connection with such a publication. The Cely papers, discov-

ered some years ago amongst the Chancery Miscellanea of the Public Record Office, by no means equal in interest that famous collection. Yet they are of great interest, and Mr. Malden, in his able preface, has skilfully pointed out in just what ways this is true. Richard Cely of Mark Lane and of Bretts in Essex, and his three sons, Richard, Robert and George, were merchants of the Staple doing business in London and constantly maintaining a junior member of the firm at Calais, where the staple for wool was situated in their time. They were well-to-do persons, whose business led them on considerable journeys and familiarized them with large affairs. Their correspondence, exceedingly well edited, illustrates the whole history of the woollen trade, from the gathering of wool (varied by courting) in the Cotswolds to its sale to Flemish and other merchants (varied apparently by smuggling, privateering and possibly piracy) at Calais. The editor's preface elucidates fully the organization of the merchants of the Staple and the operations of the woollen trade, and the relations which it bore during these years to the complications of international politics. There are brief appendixes on contemporary coinage and on the contemporary wool marts.

Mr. Charles H. Firth has edited for the same society *The Narrative of General Venables*, with an Appendix of Papers relating to the Expedition to the West Indies and the Conquest of Jamaica, 1654-1655 (Longmans, pp. xli, 180). Venables's narrative is derived from two manuscripts in the British Museum. Its object is to vindicate his own conduct as general, and to show that the disasters which befell the expedition were due to the mistakes and misconduct of Admiral Penn and others. He quotes a good number of letters in various support of his contention, and concludes with a refutation of the anonymous "Brief and Perfect Journal of the late Proceedings and Success of the English Army in the West Indies, by I. S., an Eyewitness," printed in the *Harleian Miscellany*, Vol. III. The appendixes contain the instructions given to those who were to prepare the expedition, the commission given to the commissioners who were to command it, the instructions given to Venables as general, a contemporary list of the forces, certain additional papers of Venables, a journal or series of letters relating to the expedition, from an anonymous manuscript in the Rawlinson collection, some extracts from the journal of one Henry Whistler, and certain pieces from the unpublished Thurloe MSS., among them a Spanish warning not to trespass, couched in strange English, which English sailors found on the deserted island of the Tortugas. Beside this illustrative matter, Mr Firth has supplied, in an excellent introduction, an account of the commissioners (of whom, it will be remembered, Edward Winslow was one), of the officers, of the forces, and of the events and mistakes of the expedition.

Essai sur le Système de Politique Étrangère de J. J. Rousseau : La République Confédérative des Petits États, par J. L. Windenberger, Professeur au Lycée de Chaumont. (Paris : Picard, pp. 308.) At a

time when the relations between states are so frequently a subject of discussion in the domain of political science, it is interesting to go back and examine the international politics of the great revolutionist of the eighteenth century. M. Windenberger begins his work with a review of the system of Rousseau as applied to a single state, but follows the enquiry a stage farther. Assuming the existence of a social contract, how shall the small state, which was Rousseau's ideal, maintain itself in the presence of powerful and aggressive neighbors? This difficulty, Rousseau thought, could not be met by the aid of religious principles alone, nor could the solution be found in war. The true remedy is the application of the principle of contract to international relations. As the free consent of individuals forms the state, so on a larger scale the free consent of states may be the basis of an association of states protecting all its members. Rousseau's idea was, so reasons the author, that this protective association should not be a mere league, since this would be too ephemeral in nature to afford the security desired; nor yet a federal state in which protection might be obtained, but at the cost of the sovereignty of the contracting states. The proper form of association is the confederacy, in which the several states retain their independence and sovereignty.

M. Windenberger asserts, and repeats the assertion, that Rousseau's international contract corresponds exactly to the social contract (pp. 234, 251). As the author himself shows, however, in the social contract the parties to the agreement forfeit their sovereignty, and the state becomes the sole judge of its own competence. But in the confederation (which he carefully distinguishes from the federal state) the parties to the contract retain their individual independence and sovereignty. At this important point the analogy breaks down. It is true that as far as the *purpose* is concerned Rousseau's social and his international contract are alike in that they rest upon the desire for common protection; in result, however, the contracts are widely different, since one involves a loss of sovereignty on the part of the contracting parties, while the other imposes no such necessity.

M. Windenberger's book presents a careful and complete study of the international politics of Rousseau, but all that is new in his discussion might easily have been stated with greater brevity. The last 50 pages of the book contain interesting extracts from the Geneva manuscript of the *Contrat Social*, and unpublished manuscripts in the Neuchâtel library.

C. E. MERRIAM.

We have received the fifth and sixth volumes of the *Skrifter utgjyna af Kongl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Upsala* (Upsala, C. J. Lundström). Each contains several papers of historical interest. In Band V. Professor Karl Piehl discusses certain brief inscriptions, of the later periods of Egyptian history, coming from the temple of Horus at Edsou. J. M. Sundén, "De Tribunicia Potestate a L. Sulla imminuta Quaestiones," deals especially with the question whether Sulla abolished

the legislative power exercised by the tribunes by means of the plebiscita, or only, as maintained by Mommsen, limited it by requiring the previous assent of the senate; he holds that it was abolished. Professor P. Persson investigates an inscription discovered a few years ago at Tarentum (*Monumenti Antichi*, VI. 411 ff.), containing a portion of the laws of the municipium, of date between 89 and 62 B. C. Mr. I. S. Landtmanson discusses, chiefly upon the basis of the territorial codes, the closing period of slavery in Sweden, down to King Magnus Eriksson's ordinance of Skara, 1335. Finally there is an essay by Professor Harold Hjärne on the negotiations between Sweden and Russia from 1564 to 1572 and the efforts of Eric XIV. and Ivan IV. toward mutual alliance in view of their respective wars against Denmark and Poland and the disaffection existing within their kingdoms. In Band VI. Dr. E. Wadstein essays a new interpretation of the runic inscription on the ring of the church-door of Forsa, the oldest of Swedish legal inscriptions, and examines (in an article written in English) the Clermont runic casket in the British Museum (with plates), giving the first interpretation of the figures and inscription on the missing side-piece, which has lately come into the possession of the municipal museum at Florence. Dr. C. Hallendorff discusses the policy of King Augustus of Saxony and Poland in 1700 and 1701, more especially with reference to his plans for the joint attack of Russia, Denmark and his own subjects on Sweden. Dr. K. Ahlenius continues his studies of Olaus Magnus and his northern geography by a careful study of the geography and cartography of Scandinavia in the latter half of the sixteenth century, as represented by Continental and Scandinavian authorities. The papers in these volumes are written in Swedish, Latin, German, French and English. Some of those written in Swedish are accompanied with summaries in German.

The Royal Historical Society has published Vol. I. of *The Despatches and Correspondence of John, Second Earl of Buckinghamshire, Ambassador to the Court of Catherine II. of Russia, 1762-1765* (Longmans, pp. 256), edited by Miss Adelaide D'Arcy Collier. The editor contributes an excellent introduction, giving an account of the diplomatic relations between England and Russia from 1739 and the conclusion of the Anglo-Russian alliance in 1742 down to the time when Lord Buckinghamshire set out on his mission. He was accredited to Peter III., Keith having become unacceptable to the new czar because of a suspicion that he was unfaithful to Frederick of Prussia. But before the new ambassador left England, news came of the revolution which had brought to the throne the Empress Catherine II., and his instructions were composed with this in view. It was to have been expected that those instructions should have been printed in this volume, but they are not. The papers which it contains are Lord Buckinghamshire's own papers, preserved at his house of Blickling in Norfolk, and now possessed by the Marchioness of Lothian. Most of them were discovered recently, since the report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission on the earl's despatches. In part

they consist of the ambassador's letters to the Secretary of State, Halifax, to his friend George Grenville, to Lady Suffolk and others; in part of his "Russian Memoranda," disconnected pieces written apparently on his return voyage; in part of letters, despatches and memoranda written by other diplomats, of which he was furnished with copies. The most important of these last are two memoirs, by Finckenstein and Sir Andrew Mitchell, respectively, written in September 1762, and occupying an important position in the records of the "strained relations" between Lord Bute's government and Frederick the Great. Thorough and excellent annotations help the diplomatic story. Moreover Lord Buckinghamshire writes well, and shows much that is interesting respecting the court of Catherine in the earlier part of her reign. An appendix contains a "système" drawn up by Bestushev Rjumin for the Empress Elizabeth at the beginning of the year 1744.

Adam Duncan, by H. W. Wilson. [The Westminster Biographies.] (Boston, Small, Maynard and Co., pp. xvi, 156.) Mr. Wilson's preface gives his reasons for including in the limited space at his disposal a description of life in the English navy in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Admiral Duncan's conspicuous services to his country were so closely connected with the shortcomings of the naval administration of that period and the embarrassments and dangers that ensued that one cannot truly appreciate his character as man or as commander without a knowledge of the circumstances under which he acted. Mr. Wilson's admirable little biography is its own justification of his method of dealing with his subject. That it should show throughout evidences of careful study and investigation—although especially disclaiming all "pretence at originality"—one would expect. The battle of Camperdown, for example, is described in detail and with a clearness which must make it intelligible to the "general reader," for whom the book is primarily written. The tactical peculiarities of the battle are duly emphasized. The author has carefully examined the available evidence, and has arrived at the conclusion that Duncan did not anticipate Nelson's action at Trafalgar in attempting to destroy the enemy by concentrating the English fleet upon him in detail. Such concentration as took place at Camperdown was the result of accident rather than design. Duncan's inspiration was in deciding to pass through the Dutch line and engage the enemy to leeward, thus cutting off all chance of retreat.

A Survey of American History; Source Extracts, by Howard W. Caldwell, A.M., Professor of American History in the University of Nebraska. Vol. I. (Chicago, Ainsworth and Co., pp. 255). For some time past Professor Caldwell has been publishing in a Nebraska educational journal a series of historical studies, intended to aid teachers by presenting for each of several important topics in American history a selection of extracts from the original documents and writings, accompanied with comments and elucidations. Ten of these are now grouped in a volume with the above title. They relate respectively to the found-

ing of the colonies, the development of union among them, the causes of the Revolution, the formation of the Constitution, its interpretation with respect to the question of nationality, the history of slavery, the Civil War and reconstruction, foreign relations and economic history. The chief differences between this and the other small source-books are the presence of much more than the usual amount of comment intended to direct the teacher in the use of the book, and the fact that its extracts are usually quite brief quotations, often much compressed by elision. Many interesting bits are presented, which it will do teachers good to contemplate. Yet the book seems scrappy, and it is questionable whether its plan is a wise one. The author would concede that in no one of his chapters are the quotations sufficient of themselves to enable the student to form a judgment. Especially is this true of the last two studies, which present only a few items in two vast fields. The question is, whether the student does not get more of that for which the study of original materials is valuable, by studying thoroughly the whole of a small number of documents so selected that by their means he acquires something like a complete knowledge of a few transactions.

Stephen Decatur, by Cyrus Townsend Brady. [The Beacon Biographies]. (Boston: Small, Maynard and Co., 1900, pp. xviii, 142.) Mr. Brady has had access to material belonging to the descendants of Decatur, and has also drawn upon the manuscript collections of the Pennsylvania Historical Society. The result of his efforts is a clear and graphic description of the man and his work, in which the picturesque and heroic largely predominate.

The burning of the *Philadelphia* in the harbor of Tripoli, and the battle with the Tripolitans which followed, are given with great fullness of detail. So also are the engagements between the *Macedonian* and the *United States* where Decatur first commanded as a captain, and that resulting in the loss of the *President* after a gallant struggle against overwhelming odds. The greater part of the book is occupied with "wars and rumors of wars." Mr. Brady is frankly a hero-worshipper, and treats his subject with an open admiration that at times amounts to naïveté. He regards with undisguised indignation all slurs or criticisms upon his idol. This method of writing historical biography is not judicial, but it may fairly be said that it is in great part its own corrective.

The fifteenth volume of the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, second series, embraces the records of meetings held from March 1899 to February 1900 inclusive, the first series of meetings held in the Society's new building, of which a heliotype picture is given. Among the papers included are the address of the President, Mr. Charles Francis Adams, on Historians and Historical Societies, an address read upon the occasion of the formal opening of the building; a careful paper by Mr. John T. Hassam on the early attempts at colonization in the Bahama Islands; and two papers by Mr. Andrew McF. Davis on the provincial currency of Massachusetts, the latter a curious study of Occult

Methods of Protecting the Provincial Currency. Mr. C. F. Adams has a paper on the Detention of the Laird Rams, exploding, with the aid of his father's papers and the *Life of John M. Forbes*, the legendary elements in the account of the matter presented by the late Mr. L. E. Chittenden in his *Recollections of President Lincoln and his Administration*. It is worth while remarking that this, and some remarks by the same writer on the battle of New Orleans, are practically the only papers in the volume, save obituary notices, that deal with any matters subsequent to 1775. Mr. Robert N. Toppan communicates to the *Proceedings* the full text of the Council records of Massachusetts under the administration of President Joseph Dudley, derived from a transcript in the Massachusetts archives and ultimately from the Public Record Office in London. These records, sixty pages in extent, supplement the Andros records which Mr. Toppan has already printed in the *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*.

Vol. III. of the *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, a substantial volume of 577 pages, embraces the proceedings of the society from January 1895 to April 1897 inclusive. There is much valuable matter in the book, along with some conventional antiquarianism. Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis follows up a definite and important line of research in a paper on Provincial Banks, Land and Silver, and presents another on the case of Frost *vs.* Leighton, previously discussed in this REVIEW (II. 229). To the former of these subjects Mr. Davis recurs in the portion of Vol. V. which has been issued, in a paper called a Connecticut Land Bank, relating to the New London Society United for Trade and Commerce, chartered by the Connecticut Assembly in 1732. This, like the Massachusetts Land Banks of 1686 and 1714, he finds to have been due to the influence of the pamphlet, *A Model for Erecting a Bank of Credit*, London, 1684 and 1688. Mr. John Noble, clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court, of whose arrangement of the very extensive files of that court we have already spoken, contributes papers on the Trial and Punishment of Crime in the Massachusetts of the seventeenth century, on the libel suit of Knowles *vs.* Douglass, 1748, 1749, and other matters from his Suffolk files. Mr. A. P. C. Griffin's bibliography of the historical publications of the New England states also deserves notice. Professor George L. Goodale of Harvard University, the eminent botanist, has an interesting essay on New England plants seen by the earliest colonists; Mr. Henry D. Sedgwick, one on Robert Sedgwick. Many interesting letters or documents are produced and commented on, especially a letter of President Dunster to a committee of the General Court in 1653, of real importance to the history of Harvard College. The commemoration of deceased members occupies, in the sum, 126 pages; the index, marked by extraordinary elaboration, eighty-seven. Vol. II. is to contain the commissions and instructions of the royal governors of Massachusetts, their commissions as vice-admirals, and the commission of Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, a document recently discovered, giv-

ing him authority to exercise episcopal jurisdiction in the colonies; but this volume is still delayed. Vol IV. will contain, among other things, a calendar of papers relating to the Land Banks. In the installment of Vol. V. already issued, the most noteworthy matters are a fragment of the original journal of the Massachusetts House of Deputies for 1649, recently discovered, a discussion of the real character of Vol. III. of the printed *Massachusetts Records*, a paper on Henry Pelham, one on some Massachusetts Tories, and one, by Mr. Albert Matthews, of much value as a contribution to our social history, on the history of the expressions "hired man" and "help."

Old Landmarks and Historic Personages of Boston, by Samuel Adams Drake, new and revised edition. (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1900, pp. xviii, 484.) This is an excellent reprint of a deservedly popular book. The text shows frequent alterations from that of the first edition of 1872, but these are for the most part slight in character. The description of the Boston Athenaeum (p. 38) has been rewritten, and throughout the volume changes in phraseology and slight revisions of descriptions are numerous. In many instances the revision has been made in order to adapt the author's statements to such changes as have taken place in the Boston landmarks within the last twenty-five years. The preface has been rewritten, and some full-page illustrations have been added.

Colonial Times on Buzzard's Bay, by William Root Bliss. New edition. (Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1900, pp. 252.) This is the third edition of a readable little book on the institutions and customs prevailing along the upper shores of Buzzard's Bay. The author has made few changes in the text and these of slight significance. The preface is rewritten. An appendix gives a list of property-holders and taxable property in 1783 and 1784. An index has also been added, and the illustrations of the next preceding edition have been happily omitted.

The state of New York has printed three volumes (pp. 857, 879, 744) of the *Public Papers of George Clinton*, edited from the manuscripts possessed by the state by Mr. Hugh Hastings, who occupies the office of "state historian." The plan seems to be to print everything, and a great amount of matter interesting to Revolutionary history is presented. The first volume opens with an introduction of two hundred pages by the editor, practically a general history of the Revolution, which we cannot praise. The papers printed in this volume run from May 1775 to June 1777, those in the second volume to March 1778, those in the third to September of the same year. The editing is done after the manner which we have described in reviewing previous volumes prepared by Mr. Hastings, with almost no footnotes but enough of humorous or journalistic headings, such as "Gen. Heath shy on news," "Col. Hathorn nabs four Tories," etc.

The Cradle of the Republic; Jamestown and James River, by Lyon Gardiner Tyler, President of the College of William and Mary. (Rich-

mond, 1900, pp. 187.) Upon the antiquities of Plymouth and Boston enough has been written to cover with printed pages the greater part of their original settled areas. Meanwhile most Americans know extremely little of Jamestown, and perhaps most of that little is derived from the lively pages of *To Have and To Hold*. Accordingly President Tyler has performed an excellent service in printing this careful and thorough antiquarian account of Jamestown and its region. He traces minutely, in the pages of travellers and others, the history of the island and of the encroachments of the river, still, alas, unchecked, the history of the Indian tribes and the English town, of fort and church and graveyard, of the glass-house, the governor's house and the state house. Finally he takes up in order the old historic estates and other places on the James River, giving the origin of each name and estate and some of the facts of the local history. The book has several good and useful illustrations. The student will wish there were more footnotes or detailed references, since the book is so evidently the fruit of prolonged researches, the casual reader may wish to be tempted along by greater gifts of descriptive style; but it will interest both. It is apparently to be obtained from the author at Williamsburg, Virginia.

The University of Wisconsin: its History and its Alumni, (J. N. Purcell, Madison, 1900), is a folio volume of nearly nine hundred pages. It is artistically bound and printed, and contains many portraits and pictures which illustrate the history of Madison and the University. The editor, Mr. Reuben Gold Thwaites, of the State Historical Society, has had general supervision of the contents. His scholarly sense and good taste doubtless account for the fact that the volume is a sober piece of work of real historical value, and not merely a fulsome, uncritical dissertation upon the glories of the college and her sons. Mr. Thwaites is also author of those portions of the book dealing with the history of the city and the development of the college. It is unnecessary to say that these chapters are well written and give just the sort of information that should be given in a work of this kind. Concerning the value of the short biographies of the alumni, the reviewer cannot express an opinion, except to say that apparently the men who have really accomplished something in the world have been selected for special notice. It cannot be supposed that the publisher has issued this expensive volume for purely philanthropic purposes, but there is little, if any, internal evidence that the portraits represent the countenances of only those who have paid the price. This is high praise for a book of this character. The work was worth doing and it has been done with unusual skill and commendable reserve.

A. C. McL.

The Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Second Series, Vol. V., 1899, has just appeared. Some 450 pages of the volume are made up of papers having an historical interest. The first of these, "L'Expédition du Marquis de Denonville," by M. le juge Girouard, is

an endeavor to fix the official responsibility for the cruel ruse by which a considerable detachment of the Iroquois were invited to meet the governor and intendant of New France at Fort Frontenac in order to conclude a treaty of peace, in 1687, and were there made prisoners, and eventually sent to the galleys in France. Notwithstanding the fact that the survivors were sent back to Canada by royal authority, a few years later, the author arrives at the conclusion that the home government must be held primarily responsible for the outrage. *The Builders of Nova Scotia*, by Sir John G. Bourinot, has been already noticed in these pages. A Monograph on Historic Sites in the Province of New Brunswick, by William F. Ganong, devotes most space to the relics of Indian occupation, and of the Acadian period. Major Arthur G. Doughty has a careful paper, with maps and plans, on the Probable Site of the Battle of the Plains of Abraham. Archbishop O'Brien discusses Cabot's Landfall and Chart, with especial reference to the arguments advanced by Dr. S. E. Dawson in his paper which appeared in the *Transactions* for 1897. There is an article on the Assault of Quebec by Montgomery and Arnold, in 1775, by Sir James Le Moine, and, finally, a lengthy paper entitled The Line of Demarcation of Pope Alexander VI. in 1493 and that of the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494, by Dr. Dawson, in which the subject is discussed from the point of view of medieval international law.

The *Archaeological Reports of Ontario* are printed as appendixes to the annual reports of the Minister of Education. That for 1898 (pp. 211) consists for the most part of a highly valuable report on the pagan Iroquois of the Grand River Reserve, and especially on their religion and folklore, by Mr. David Boyle, curator of the Archaeological Museum. It has excellent illustrations. The report for 1899 (pp. 199) contains descriptions and texts of their music, an account of the Wyandots, by Dr. Wm. E. Connelley, and notes concerning many Indian village sites in the province of Ontario.

Education in the United States. A Series of Monographs prepared for the United States Exhibit at the Paris Exposition, 1900. Edited by Nicholas Murray Butler, Professor of Philosophy and Education in Columbia University. (Albany, J. B. Lyon Co., two vols., pp. 468, 977.) These volumes are, it is true, mainly devoted to description of the existing state of things. But each of the essays of which they are composed contains something of the history of its especial subject. The monographs are the following, written, it will be seen, by highly competent experts: Educational Organization and Administration, by President A. S. Draper; Kindergarten Education, by Susan E. Blow; Elementary Education, by Dr. W. T. Harris; Secondary Education, by Professor E. E. Brown; The American College, by Professor A. F. West; The American University, by Professor E. D. Perry; Education of Women, by President M. Carey Thomas; Training of Teachers, by the late Professor B. A. Hinsdale; and other monographs more special.

NOTES AND NEWS

Just before our date of publication the American Historical Association holds its annual meeting at Detroit and Ann Arbor, December 27, 28 and 29. Though a full account of the meeting will, as usual, appear in the April number of the REVIEW, a statement of the proceedings as outlined in the final edition of the programme may be convenient for many readers. According to the programme, one session is devoted to the Crusades and the East, with papers by Professor George L. Burr, on the Year One Thousand and Antecedents of the Crusades; by Professor Oliver J. Thatcher on Critical Work on the Sources of the First Crusade; and by President James B. Angell on the Capitulations in Turkey. The latter paper is printed in our present issue. The session of the Church History Section will be marked by papers on American Ecclesiology, by Professor George J. Bayles; on The Origin of the Apostles' Creed, by Professor A. C. McGiffert; and on The Date of the Ignatian Epistles, by Professor Francis A. Christie. In the session devoted to Western History, Professor Edward G. Bourne will read a paper on The Legend of Marcus Whitman (see pp. 276 to 300 of the present issue); Professor Samuel B. Harding on Party Struggles in Missouri, 1861-1865; and Professor Frank H. Hodder a paper relating to the history of the Missouri Compromise. In a session which is given the title of British and American History there will be papers on The Opposition in Parliament, 1765-1775, by Professor Wilbur C. Abbott; on The Breakdown of the Old Colonial System in Canada, by Professor George M. Wrong; on British Rule in Canada, by Sir John Bourinot; and on The Breakdown of Reconstruction, by Professor W. A. Dunning.

The American Economic Association meets at the same time and place and there will be two joint sessions: one in which the presiding officers of the two associations, Mr. J. F. Rhodes and Professor Richard T. Ely, give their inaugural addresses, and another in which three papers of common interest will be read: by Professor Paul S. Reinsch on French and English Experiments with Representative Government in the West Indies; by Professor H. Morse Stephens on The Turning Points in the History of British Administration in India; and by Professor John H. Finley on Our Porto Rican Policy.

Hospitable arrangements have been made for the entertainment of the association by the Detroit Club, the University Club of Detroit, the University of Michigan, General and Mrs. Russell A. Alger and Mrs. George O. Robinson. The list of members of the Association just received exhibits a total of 1590 members. Its *Annual Report* for 1899 arrives just as we go to press.

The Public Archives Commission of the Association, organized at the Boston meeting, in December 1899, under Professor William MacDonald of Bowdoin College as chairman, has made considerable progress with the organization of its work. The following persons have been appointed as adjunct members to represent the Commission in their respective states: New Hampshire, Mr. Albert S. Batcheller, Littleton; Massachusetts, Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis, Cambridge; Rhode Island, Mr. Clarence S. Brigham, Providence; Connecticut, Mr. Albert C. Bates, Hartford; New York, Professor Herbert L. Osgood; New Jersey, Mr. William Nelson, Paterson; Pennsylvania, Dr. Herman V. Ames, Philadelphia; Virginia, Mr. William G. Stanard, Richmond; North Carolina, Professor John S. Bassett, Durham; Alabama, Mr. Thomas M. Owen, Birmingham; Mississippi, Professor Franklin L. Riley, University; Louisiana, Mr. William Beer, New Orleans; Ohio, Professor George W. Knight, Columbus; Indiana, Professor James A. Woodburn, Bloomington; Illinois, Professor F. W. Shepardson, Chicago; Iowa, Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh, Iowa City; Kansas, Professor Frank H. Hodder, Lawrence; Michigan, Mr. Harlow S. Person, Ann Arbor; Wisconsin, Dr. Orin G. Libby, Madison; Oregon, Professor F. G. Young, Eugene. The preliminary investigation into the condition of the archives of most of these states is well in hand, and the publication of the preliminary reports will probably be begun in the next report of the Association. The Commission has been so fortunate as to secure the co-operation of Mr. R. R. Bowker, of the *Publishers' Weekly*, who has placed at the disposal of the Commission the material which he has collected for his *State Publications*. In all cases the Commission has sought to work in co-operation with historical societies, state record commissions and individual investigators, with a view not only to greater effectiveness, but also to avoid duplication. The Stokes bill, providing for an investigation of the condition of both state and national records under the sanction of the national government, passed the Senate at the last session of Congress, and was favorably reported in the House. The bill, which has many supporters in Congress, will be pressed as earnestly as possible during the present session.

The Committee of the American Historical Association appointed at Boston to consider a co-operative history of the United States has reported to the Council in favor of the project and asks the Council at the Detroit meeting to appoint a standing committee of five to arrange for the publication of such a work in small volumes, each complete in itself so far as it goes. It is proposed that an editor-in-chief be chosen by the committee, and that the committee have power to make the publishing arrangements, the Association to have no pecuniary responsibility or liability.

Professor Burke A. Hinsdale, who died on November 29, 1900, was at one time Professor of English at Hiram College, Ohio, and later, president of that institution. From 1882 to 1886 he held the position of

Superintendent of Public Schools in Cleveland, and he was at the time of his death Professor of the Science and Art of Teaching at the University of Michigan. He edited the *Life and Works of James A. Garfield*, and wrote several books dealing with the early history of Christianity, as well as *The Old Northwest*, and a work upon the teaching of history.

General William S. Stryker, president of the New Jersey Historical Society and adjutant-general of the State of New Jersey, died on October 29, at the age of sixty-two. Beside compilations of the officers and men of the Revolutionary and civil wars, he wrote a volume on *The Battles of Trenton and Princeton*, published in 1898.

Lieut.-Colonel Max Jähns, author of the well-known *Geschichte der Kriegswissenschaften* and of a life of Moltke yet to be published, died at Berlin on September 19, at the age of sixty-three.

Professor J. F. Jameson of Brown University, managing editor of this review, is to become head of the department of history at the University of Chicago, but will retain his connection with the journal until the issue of the July number, and may, up to that time, be addressed as usual at 196 Bowen Street, Providence.

Rev. Dr. John Gordon has been elected professor of history in Tabor College, Iowa.

The *Revue de Synthèse Historique*, a new journal published in Paris by Léopold Cerf, of which the first number has lately appeared, will endeavor to present, from time to time, summary reviews or conspectuses of the existing state of historical study, now in one field now in another, showing what is done and what is yet to do. While avoiding what is vague and arbitrary, it will essay to keep different parts and aspects of history in relation with each other, and in relation with allied sciences, and to counteract the tendency toward extreme specialization. The first number contains an article on "Histoire et Synthèse," by M. Émile Boutroué; an introduction to the study of the individual regions of France, by M. Pierre Foncin; an article on historical methods in Germany, by Professor Karl Lamprecht; and one on "La Science de l'Histoire d'après M. Xénopol," by M. Paul Lacombe.

An English translation of Professor Helmolt's *Weltgeschichte* will shortly be published by Dodd, Mead and Co.

Economics and Industrial History for Secondary Schools, by Henry W. Thurston (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co.) would seem to be a teacher's manual which attempts to apply the "laboratory" method to the study of economic and industrial problems.

The inaugural address delivered at the conference of the International Law Association, at Rouen, by Judge Simeon E. Baldwin, of New Haven, upon "The Part taken by Courts of Justice in the Development of International Law," has been published in the *Yale Law Journal* for November.

A series of *Historical Leaflets*, containing reprints or translations of documentary material for church history, will be issued by the department of church history in the Crozer Theological Seminary, at Chester, Penn. For the year 1901 such documents have been chosen as relate to the Reformation period.

On December 12 the centennial celebration of the establishment of the seat of government in the District of Columbia took place in Washington. Various addresses were made, including one upon the transfer of the capital from Philadelphia to Washington. In this connection mention may be made of *The Removal of the Seat of Government to the District of Columbia*, two papers read before the District of Columbia Historical Society by Mr. Wilhelmus B. Bryan and Mr. Samuel C. Busey (Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, Senate Document No. 62).

The Macmillan Co. will publish shortly in the "Citizens' Library of Economics, Politics and Sociology," *Colonial Government* by Professor Paul S. Reinsch. The book will treat of the methods of colonization, the forms of colonial government, the relations between colonies and the mother-country, and the special colonial problems of the United States.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

Early Babylonian History down to the End of the Fourth Dynasty of Ur, by Rev. Hugo Radau, is an expansion of a dissertation for the doctor's degree in Columbia University, in 1898. An appendix of 123 pages is devoted to a description and discussion of a valuable collection of Babylonian tablets (some 262 in all) which have been recently acquired by the General Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church in New York.

The Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund for October contains the announcement of the resignation of Dr. F. J. Bliss, so long the Director of Excavations, on account of ill-health. His report contained in this number covers the excavations just concluded at Tell Sandahannah (St. Anna). A Seleucidan city was laid bare at this place. The Israelite remains underneath this city were touched only at one point, owing to the expiration of the period of excavation.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Goldschmied, *Die Chronologie des Buches von den Königen* (Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, LIV. 1); R. D. Wilson, *Ecclesiasticus* (Presbyterian and Reformed Review, July); U. Köhler, *Der thukydideische Bericht über die oligarchische Unwälzung in Athen im Jahre 411* (Sitzungsberichte der k. pr. Akademie zu Berlin, July); E. Pais, *Saxum Tarpeium; Osservazioni Topografiche e Giuridiche* (Rivista di Storia Antica, V. 1); L. Cantarelli, *Origine e Governo delle Provincie Africane sotto l'Impero* (ibid.).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

In *Les Moines d'Orient antérieurs au Concile de Chalédoine* (Paris, Oudin) Dom J. M. Besse considers the history of Eastern monachism chiefly from the standpoint of a student of the origins of the Benedictine rule.

The second volume of Abbé Duchesne's *Fastes Épiscopaux de l'Antienne Gaule* (Paris, Fontemoing, pp. 485) comprises the two Aquitanias, Novempopulania, and the four Lugdunensian provinces, fifty-eight dioceses in all. A third volume will finish this monumental work.

Inscriptionum Hispaniae Christianarum Supplementum, by Dr. Emil Hübner, has been published at Berlin by G. Reimer (pp. 162).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

A new edition of Professor Edwin A. Grosvenor's *Constantinople* is published by Little, Brown and Co. Except for one or two slight verbal alterations the text is in all respects identical with that of the first edition of 1895.

The greater part of Tom. XIX., fasc. 2, of the *Analecta Bollandiana* is devoted to a detailed critical examination of the Franciscan "Legenda Trium Sociorum," which the investigator believes to be, not what it claims to be, but a composition of the latter part of the thirteenth century. Fasc. 3 has an article on Julian of Speyer, another of the biographers of St. Francis; also the Greek legend of St. Alexis, the Greek acts of St. Dometius, and a critical account by Father Paul de Loë of the sources for the biography of Albertus Magnus, whose life the Bollandists will treat under November 15. Both numbers are accompanied by installments of a supplement to Abbé Ulysse Chevalier's *Repertorium Hymnologicum*.

Of Blume and Dreves's *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi*, Vols. XXXV. and XXXVI., just published (Leipzig, O. R. Reisland) contain a collection of rhymed psalters, with some similar documents.

The Cambridge University Press are publishing a translation from the German, by Professor Maitland, of Dr. Otto Gierke's work on *Political Theories of the Middle Age*.

A revised edition of Sir Henry Yule's *Marco Polo* will be brought out by Mr. John Murray, edited by Professor Henri Cordier, with a memoir of Colonel Yule. Mr. Murray also announces the second volume of Mr. C. Raymond Beazley's *Dawn of Modern Geography*.

MODERN HISTORY.

Students of the Reformation should be notified of Dr. A. Erichson's *Bibliographia Calviniana*, announced by C. A. Schwetke and Son of Berlin.

The Hakluyt Society have just published the *Voyage of Captain John Saris to Japan, 1613*, edited by Sir Ernest M. Satow, K.C.M.G., formerly envoy extraordinary in Japan and now in China. The chief contents of the book is a journal of Saris's voyage from Bantam to Japan in 1613 and of his stay in Japan, printed from the manuscript in the India Office Records. It also contains a trade report of his, written during his residence at Bantam, 1605-1609, a letter which he wrote at the Cape on his return, and his final report to the East India Company, written at Plymouth.

Dr. Hans Schlitter, archivist at Vienna, after publishing many of the necessary documents in his *Briefe und Denkschriften zur Vorgeschichte der belgischen Revolution* (Vienna, Holzhausen, pp. 125), has now brought out through the same house the first part of a highly important work on *Die Regierung Josefs II. in den österreichischen Niederlanden*. The present part extends to the recall of Count Murray (pp. 298).

Dr. Hermann Hüffer, in his series of *Quellen zur Geschichte des Zeitalters der französischen Revolution*, derived from various Viennese archives, has published the first part of a volume of documents on the battle of Marengo and the Italian campaign of 1800 (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner).

Perhaps no more important contribution to the diplomatic history of the Napoleonic period has appeared during the past year than Professor August Fournier's *Der Kongress von Chatillon; Die Politik im Kriege von 1814* (Vienna and Prag, Tempsky, pp. 397), based on extensive archive studies in several countries.

The November number of the *Revue Historique* contains a summary review of the Rumanian historical publications of the years 1894-98, by D. A. Teodoru and A. D. Xenopol, continued from the preceding number and concluded.

Messrs. Gibbings and Co. will publish a new edition of *A Short History of China*, by Demetrius Charles Boulger, containing an additional chapter upon the history from 1890 to the present time, by a writer whose name is not stated.

Methuen and Co. publish a careful handbook on China, by Mr. J. Robertson-Scott, entitled *The People of China: Their Country, History, Life, Ideas, and Relations to the Foreigner*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Saglio, *L'Agonie des Ming; Épisode de l'Histoire de Chine* (*Revue Historique*, September); K. T. Heigel, *Zur Geschichte des Rastatter Gesandtenmordes am 28. April 1799* (*Historische Vierteljahrsschrift*, III. 4); L. Thouvenel, *La Question Romaine en 1862* (*Revue de Paris*, July 1).

GREAT BRITAIN.

The council of the Royal Historical Society have issued a circular calling attention to the desirability of forming a School of Advanced Historical Studies in London, in order to provide systematic instruction in

the investigation of historical materials. The curriculum suggested would provide courses in methodology, palaeography and diplomatics, the bibliography of printed and manuscript sources, and would also include archaeology, epigraphy, and numismatics. The council proposes the formation of a general committee to consider the project.

The British Government has published *Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward III., 1337-1339*; *Calendar of State Papers (Venetian)*, Vol. X., 1603-1607; *Calendar of Treasury Books and Papers, 1735-1738*; a report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, on the Manuscripts of Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, and Vol. 88 (1895-1896) of the *British and Foreign State Papers*.

The Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts has published a third volume (pp. li, 710) of its calendar of the papers of Mr. J. B. Fortescue of Dropmore, edited by Mr. Walter FitzPatrick, with a preface for both Vol. II. and Vol. III. The main text of the volume covers the years 1795, 1796 and 1797. But many earlier papers, 1787-1796, have been discovered at Dropmore since Vol. II. was printed, and these are now incorporated in an appendix. Taken as a whole the book is a highly important contribution to the history of the diplomacy of England under Grenville.

Messrs. Longmans announce for early publication Vol. III. (1654-1656) of Dr. S. R. Gardiner's *History of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate*; and *The Sources and Literature of English History, to 1485*, by Professor Charles Gross, of Harvard; and *A Critical Examination of Irish History*, by T. Dunbar Ingram.

The *Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds in the Public Record Office*, of which the first volume was published in 1890, has now reached its third (Eyre and Spottiswoode, Rolls Series), which, beside continuing those in the treasury of the receipt of the exchequer, court of augmentations and court of chancery, gives others from the queen's remembrancer's department of the exchequer. Fifteen thousand deeds have now been catalogued.

The Pipe Roll Society has published *The Feet of Fines of the Tenth Year of the Reign of Richard I.*, and, announcing that its funds are exhausted, and that it will publish nothing more, has dissolved.

Messrs. Archibald Constable and Co. will publish a new edition of *The Paston letters, 1422-1509*, in which the separate prefaces and introductions to the three volumes by the editor, Mr. James Gairdner, will be superseded by a general preface and a general introduction in a volume by itself. This volume will also contain a supplement, in which the Roydon Hall letters will be printed from the original MSS. now in the British Museum, with a few other originals hitherto unedited.

Students of the history of the Pilgrim Fathers will be glad to know of the publication (London, J. Clarke) of Mr. F. J. Powicke's *Henry*

Barrowe, Separatist (1550?-1593) and the Exiled Church of Amsterdam (1593-1622), pp. 412.

It is announced that the next volume in the well-known "Goupil" series will be a memoir of Queen Anne, whose reign surely supplies abundant material for that lavish display of illustration which forms one of the greatest attractions of the Goupil series.

Mr. David Nutt publishes *The Rising of 1745: with a Bibliography of Jacobite History, 1689-1788*, by Charles Sanford Terry, M.A. This is the third volume in the series, "Scottish History from Contemporary Writers." The appendix contains a good bibliography of Jacobite history. A letter written by Charles Edward to Cluny Macpherson when on board *L'Heureux*, September 20, 1746, is reproduced.

A new edition of Gibbon's *Memoirs*, edited by Dr. Birkbeck Hill, is to be published in England by Methuen, and in the United States by Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

A new edition of the *Letters of Horace Walpole* is in preparation by Mrs. Paget Toynbee, for the Clarendon Press. It will consist of ten or eleven octavo volumes, and will be provided with a full index.

The *Life and Correspondence of the Rt. Hon. Hugh Culling Eardley Childers*, by his son, Lieut.-Colonel Spencer Childers, will soon be published by John Murray, who also has in press *The Autobiography of Lt.-General Sir Harry Smith, Bart., of Aliwal, G. C. B.*, edited by Mr. G. C. Moore Smith.

Messrs. Blackwood and Sons will shortly issue a volume of reminiscences by the late "Father of the House of Commons," Sir John Mowbray, Bart. It is entitled *Seventy Years at Westminster*. Sir John was a member of Lord Derby's government in 1858. The book will contain his articles which appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine*, supplemented by letters and notes, edited by his daughter.

The *Life and Letters of Thomas Huxley*, by his son, Leonard Huxley, is just published by D. Appleton and Co. The narrative is made up in great part of Huxley's letters. There are several appendixes.

Messrs. Longmans and Co. announce the second volume of Sir William Hunter's *History of British India*, which takes up the narrative at the overthrow of the English in the Spice Archipelago in 1623, and carries it up to the time of the Union of the old and new Companies in 1708. Sir William's death left the ninth chapter uncompleted; and his outline of this has been filled in by other hands.

Captain A. T. Mahan's *The War in South Africa* (New York, Peter Fenelon Collier and Son) covers the operations of the earlier days in Natal, the contest in Cape Colony and the southern Free State, and practically ends with the occupation of Bloemfontein by the British. Subsequent events are dismissed in brief paragraphs. Sir John G. Bourinot has written an introduction. The book is elaborately illustrated.

Ladysmith: The Diary of a Siege, by H. W. Nevinson (New York, New Amsterdam Book Co.), appeared originally in the form of letters to the London *Daily Chronicle*, for which Mr. Nevinson acted as special correspondent. Besides dealing with the 118 days' siege of Ladysmith, the book contains accounts of the engagements immediately preceding.

Messrs. William Blackwood and Sons announce *A History of Rhodesia, compiled from Official Sources*, by Howard Hensman. The book was planned and the greater part written before the Boer war, but chapters dealing with the sieges of Kimberley and Mafeking, and the movements of Colonel Plumer's Rhodesian force, have been added.

The Story of Egypt, by W. Basil Worsfold ("Story of the Empire Series," London, Horace Marshall and Son), not only deals with the history of the country, but has supplementary chapters upon justice, education, and industrial progress in the Sudan.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. H. Round, *Colchester and the Commonwealth* (English Historical Review, October); B. Williams, *The Foreign Policy of England under Walpole*, III. (ibid.); A. T. Mahan, *Nelson at Naples* (ibid.).

FRANCE.

We call attention again to the *Bibliothèque des Bibliographies Critiques* which the Société des Études Historiques is publishing. These useful pamphlets range in size from seven or eight pages ("La Prise de la Bastille") to twenty-seven ("Histoire de l'Industrie en France avant 1789" and "La Guerre de 1870-1871") or more. Ten have been published already. Among those promised are lists for each period of French history, for many of the provinces and towns of France, etc.

M. Félix Alcan announces a new volume in the *Recueil des Instructions données aux Ambassadeurs*, namely, a volume for Prussia, by M. A. Waddington; and Vol. IV. of M. Zevort's *Histoire de la Troisième République*, dealing with the period of President Carnot.

Professor Imbart de la Tour of Bordeaux has reprinted in a volume (Paris, Picard) the excellent series of articles on *Les Paroisses Rurales du IV^e au XI^e Siècle* which he contributed to the *Revue Historique* in 1896-1898.

Vol. XLVIII. of the *Bulletin de la Société Archéologique du Limousin* consists of two cartularies, edited by M. de Senneville, the one belonging to the priory of Aureil, the other to that of L'Artige, and both presenting many features of interest. A cartulary of a rarer type, that of a lay seigniory, that of the Sires de Rays, edited by M. René Blanchard, is completed by the publication of its second volume, as Vol. XXX. of the *Archives Historiques du Poitou*.

Two thorough and valuable monographs in the constitutional history of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are M. O. Morel's *La Grande*

Chancellerie Royale et l'Expédition des Lettres Royaux de l'Avènement de Philippe VI. à la Fin du XIV^e Siècle, published by the "Société de l'École des Chartes" (Paris, Picard), and M. E. Lameere's *Le Grand Conseil des Ducs de Bourgogne de la Maison de Valois* (Brussels, Castaigne). M. R. Genestal, in his *La Tenure en Bourgage* (Paris, A. Rousseau), studies for Normandy the same problem of the legal status of urban property which M. Des Marez has illustrated so thoroughly in the case of Belgium.

It is announced that in the Cambridge Historical Series (University Press) there will shortly appear two volumes on *The French Monarchy, 1483-1789*, by Mr. A. J. Grant, professor of history in the Yorkshire College at Leeds.

Upon occasion of the Paris Exposition M. Henri Avenel has presented to the ministry of commerce a voluminous report entitled *Histoire de la Presse Française depuis 1789 jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, Flammarion, pp. 892).

The sixth series of Baron Alberto Lumbroso's *Miscellanea Napoleonica* contains a large number of letters of Napoleon heretofore unprinted, some of them derived from the proof-sheets of the *Correspondance de Napoléon I.*, from which they were ultimately dropped.

The volume on Napoleon (London, A. L. Humphreys) upon which Lord Rosebery has long been at work, is especially concerned with Napoleon's residence at St. Helena. The book is published in the United States by Harper and Brothers, and is entitled *Napoleon: The Last Phase*.

Souvenirs Contemporains, by the Marquis de Belleval (Paris, Vivien, pp. 432) is an amusing and interesting book, having especial value for its description of the entourage of the Comte de Chambord.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: B. de Mandrot, *L'Autorité Historique de Philippe de Comynnes*, II. (Revue Historique, September); V. L. Bourrilly, *François I. et les Protestants*; *Les Essais de Concorde en 1535*, I. (Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, 1900, 7); Abbé Feret, *L'Université de Paris et les Jésuites au Commencement du XVII^e Siècle* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); F. T. Perrens, *Le Premier Abbé Dubois*, I. (Revue Historique, November); G. Fagniez, *L'Opinion Publique et la Presse Politique sous Louis XIII., 1624-1626* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, 1900, 3); *Correspondance Intime du Général Jean Hardy, 1797-1802, Expéditions d'Irlande et de St. Domingue* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 1); G. Caudrillier, *Le Complot de l'an XII.*, I. (Revue Historique, November); G. de Grandmaison, *Talleyrand et les Affaires d'Espagne en 1808* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); L. G. Pélié, *La Trahison de Masséna* (Revue Historique, September).

ITALY, SPAIN.

Hoepli of Milan has undertaken to produce, in a series of volumes, a history of Italy, which shall be scientific in spirit while popular in form. The most recent of these volumes is *Le Invasione Barbariche in Italia*, by Professor Pasquale Villari, giving an account of the fall of the Western Empire, and proceeding to the coronation of Charlemagne in 800.

The Rulers of the South; Sicily, Calabria, Malta, in two volumes, by F. Marion Crawford (The Macmillan Co.) is a companion work to the author's *Ave Roma Immortalis*, and deals in a similar manner with history and legends.

The *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* contains an "Iter Italicum" of Arnold von Buchell, 1565-1645, a document of great interest for the topography of Rome in the sixteenth century, preserved at Utrecht. It bears date 1587. Dr. P. Fedele presents the first part of a series of documents of Santa Maria Nova, 982-1100. The documents of the monastery of San Silvestro de Capite, and those published by Tomassetti on the Campagna are continued. The society has in preparation an edition of the *Liber Historiarum Romanarum* and Vol. I. (Vols. II.-V. having already been published) of the *Regesto di Farfa*.

Part II. of Dr. R. Davidsohn's *Forschungen zur Geschichte von Florenz* (Berlin, Mittler, pp. 352) consists of a calendar, with some papers reproduced in full, of documents of San Gemignano dating from 1318 to 1341.

Dr. Max Immich's *Papst Innocenz XI., 1676-1689; Beiträge zur Geschichte seiner Politik und zur Charakteristik seiner Persönlichkeit* (Berlin, Speyer und Peters), continues his study of that pope's diplomacy, already mentioned in these pages, by an endeavor to account for his policy.

In the *Revue Historique* for September Don Rafael Altamira gives a summary review of Spanish historical publications, both books and articles, of the years 1897 and 1898.

Messrs. Lea Brothers and Co. (Philadelphia) will publish shortly *The Moriscos of Spain, Their Conversion and Expulsion*, by Henry Charles Lea, LL.D. The author has used documents from the Spanish archives, and purposes to give a connected account of the vicissitudes of this remarkable people.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. Schnitzer, *Zur Geschichte der Sklaverei zu Florenz im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert* (Römische Quartalschrift, XIV. 1-2); J. Schnitzer, *Zur Geschichte Alexanders VI.* (Historisches Jahrbuch, 1900, 1); *Sulla Via de Roma; Da Aspromonte a Mentana; Documenti Inediti* (Nuova Antologia, June 15); H. Léonardon, *Prim et la Candidature Hohenzollern* (Revue Historique, November); A. R. Whiteway, *Customs of the Western Pyrenees* (English Historical Review, October).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

Beginning with the new year, Mr. Felix Dietrich (Leipzig) will issue annual volumes of a *Bibliographie der deutschen Recensionen*, edited by Mr. L. Jellinek as a supplement to the *Bibliographie der Zeitschriften-Literatur*. The purpose is to furnish a list of book-reviews that have appeared during the year in about a thousand scientific and technical journals of Germany.

In the *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXVI. 3, Professor Georg von Below prints a long article on theories of the economic development of nations, with especial reference to the economics of German cities in the Middle Ages. The plans of the Prussian patriots for a rising in the summer of 1808 are illustrated by some unprinted memorials of Gneisenau and Scharnhorst. A considerable portion of Gneisenau's correspondence has lately been published at the instance of his present representatives under the title *Aus der Zeit der Noth, 1806 bis 1815, Schilderungen der preussischen Geschichte* (Berlin, Mittler, pp. 390).

The Historical Commission of the Bavarian Academy intends shortly to bring out the first volume of the correspondence of Conrad Celtis, the third of that of the elector Johann Casimir, the third of the chronicles of Lübeck (continuations of Detmar and Rufus), the writings of Andreas of Ratisbon, and the chronicle of Ulrich Fueterer.

Among the announcements for the *Leipziger Studien aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte* we notice a treatise by Dr. Hashagen on "Otto von Freising als Geschichtsphilosoph und Kirchenpolitiker."

Professor Aloys Schulte of Breslau has brought out, in two volumes (Leipzig, Duncker and Humblot, pp. 742, 358) a *Geschichte des mittelalterlichen Handels und Verkehrs zwischen Westdeutschland und Italien, mit Ausschluss von Venedig*. The second volume consists of documents, 451 in number. This is one of the publications planned by the Historical Commission of Baden.

Vol. II. of the new series of *Hansische Geschichtsquellen* is devoted to *Die Lübecker Bergensfahrer und ihre Chronistik*, set forth by Dr. Friedrich Bruns.

In Steinhause's *Monographien zur deutschen Kulturgeschichte*, No. 6 is a treatise on *Der Bauer in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (Leipzig, Diedrichs, pp. 143), with 168 illustrations derived from originals of the fifteenth and subsequent centuries.

Vol. LXXV. of the *Publikationen aus den k. preussischen Staatsarchiven*, edited by Paul Bailieu, is a collection of the correspondence of Frederick William III. and Queen Louise with the Czar Alexander I.

Messrs. Harper and Brothers have in preparation a translation of Bismarck's letters to his wife, which extend from a date some years prior to 1847, the date of his marriage, to 1892.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Kohfeldt, *Zur Geschichte der Büchersammlungen und des Bücherbesitzes in Deutschland* (Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte, VII. 5-6); J. von Pflugk-Harttung, *Ludwig der Baier in seinem Streite mit der römischen Kurie* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXI. 2); M. Laux, *Ueber den Ursprung der Landsknechte* (Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte, VIII. 1); W. Clasen, *Die Politik der schweizerischen Bauer zur Zeit Zwinglis* (Zeitschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Ergänzungsheft 4).

AMERICA

On October 3, the centennial anniversary of the birth of George Bancroft was celebrated at Worcester, Mass., by the Worcester Society of Antiquity and other organizations. A stone block with a bronze tablet marking the site of his birthplace was dedicated. An address was delivered by Gen. James Grant Wilson of New York. This, and the other proceedings, will be printed in the *Proceedings* of the society named.

Mr. J. N. Larned's *Annotated Bibliography of American History* is now in the press.

The Council of the American Antiquarian Society has appropriated money for the preparation and eventual publication of a systematic and detailed Guide to the Materials for American History to be found in the Public Record Office and other public repositories in London—an important enterprise. Students who have worked among the American papers of the Public Record Office and the British Museum are invited to send suggestions as to the details of such a guide to the managing editor of this journal.

In the *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* at its meeting of April 25, 1900 (XIII. 3), Mr. S. S. Green gives a full and interesting history of the Craigie House at Cambridge; Dr. Alexander Graham Bell a paper on Francis Green and early efforts toward the instruction of the deaf in America; Mr. George E. Francis on the Tory Dr. William Paine; Mr. G. P. Winship on John and Sebastian Cabot; Dr. C. L. Nichols on Isaiah Thomas; and Mr. Lucien Carr on the Mascoutins. Mr. R. N. Toppan completes his print of the records of Andros and his council.

No. 7 of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, Eighteenth Series, is an essay on the Constitution and Admission of Iowa into the Union, by Professor James Alton James of Northwestern University. An introductory study was published by Professor James in the *Report of the American Historical Association* for 1897. In Nos. 8-9 Dr. Herbert B. Adams has published a study of the Church and Popular Education, investigating the workings of the churches as educational institutions, especially in Baltimore.

Messrs. D. Appleton and Co. have published *The Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century*, by Dr. Edward

Eggleston,—a continuation of his work on American history of which the first volume, *Beginners of the Nation*, appeared some years ago.

The Century Company has published *Colonial Days and Ways*, by Miss Helen Evertsen Smith, a book descriptive of colonial manners and customs, and based upon the large accumulation of family letters at the Smith homestead in Sharon, Conn. The conditions of life in the early Dutch, Huguenot and New England towns are included in the subject of the volume.

Messrs. Goupil have issued, in their sumptuous series of illustrated biographical books, a handsome volume on *George Washington*, by Mr. Worthington C. Ford.

The *Catalogue of the Washington Collection* in the Boston Athenaeum was originally published without an index. This omission has now been repaired by the printing of such an *Index* (pp. 85), prepared by Mr. Franklin Osborne Poole.

Mr. Joseph Smolinski of Washington, a Polish American, has for some time occupied himself with the patriotic endeavor to collect the unpublished letters of Pulaski and Kosciuszko relating to the American Revolution. He has now begun to publish the results, in exact transcripts, in the Polish American magazine *Sztandar*, of Chicago. The letters so far printed are English or French letters of Pulaski to the Continental Congress or to General Washington, with Polish translations. The series began in the March number. The undertaking is an interesting and praiseworthy one, and deserves encouragement. We hope that possessors of letters of either of these two Polish heroes will communicate with Mr. Smolinski, whose address is 721 Eleventh Street, N. W., Washington.

As an "advance separate" from the *Report of the American Historical Association* for 1899 we have received a pamphlet by Dr. O. G. Libby of the University of Wisconsin, "A Critical Examination of Gordon's History of the American Revolution," in which he proves Gordon's extreme "indebtedness" to the *Annual Register*.

A second edition of Mrs. Elizabeth Ellet's *The Women of the American Revolution*, which first appeared in the middle of the century, is published by G. W. Jacobs and Co. (Philadelphia), edited by Miss Anne Hollingsworth Wharton.

In the thirty-ninth volume of the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Mr. J. G. Rosengarten has a paper on American history from German archives, with a list of Hessian diaries, and a reprint of Mirabeau's *Avis aux Hessois*.

Part 2 of Professor H. V. Ames's *State Documents on Federal Relations* (Department of History, University of Pennsylvania) contains a large number of interesting documents upon this important subject. They extend from 1809 to 1815, centering chiefly around the Olmstead case, the militia question in the war of 1812 and the Hartford Convention.

Most of them are hard to procure, and their collection, with excellent notes, is a most praiseworthy achievement.

Macmillan and Co. have taken over from Harper and Brothers the publication of Dr. James Ford Rhodes's *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850*, of which a new edition will be published at once.

The Bureau of Education has published a preliminary bibliography of *Confederate Text-books*, compiled by Dr. Stephen B. Weeks. Additions to the list are solicited.

Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons have published a new edition of McCulloch's *Men and Measures of Half a Century*, and have thus put before the public a smaller, less expensive, and more satisfactory, because less unwieldy, volume than was the first edition of this well-known work.

The President's *Message transmitting the Treaty of Peace with Spain* (Fifty-fifth Congress, third session, Senate Document No. 62, Part 1). contains beside the treaty and the protocols of the negotiations much correspondence of the American consuls in the Philippines with Aguinaldo and others, as well as with the State Department.

The Prince Society has in preparation a volume upon Samuel Maverick, including his Description of New England, letters and other papers, and a memoir by Mr. Frank W. Hackett. They also announce volumes upon Sir Humphrey Gilbert, with a memoir by Rev. Carlos Slafter, and the letters of Governor Hutchinson and Lieut.-Governor Oliver, 1768-1769, edited by Mr. Thornton K. Lothrop.

The Massachusetts Historical Society has lately acquired the mass of correspondence which was accumulated by the late W. W. Story, when preparing the *Life and Letters of Joseph Story*. It includes many interesting letters of Marshall, Story, Webster and others.

The Preston and Rounds Co. (Providence) will publish a *Civil and Military List of Rhode Island*, from 1647 to 1800, compiled from the records by Mr. Joseph J. Smith. The civil list will include sheriffs, justices, colonial agents, clerks of courts, and many minor officials, down to ferrymen.

The October *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* contains some interesting letters of Lowell, 1843-1854. That of November contains an elaborate list of references to documents, etc., relating to the boundaries of the State of New York. The *Calendar of the Emmet Collection* has been drawn off from the pages of the *Bulletin* into a volume of which a few copies are for sale.

The state of New York has issued a second edition of *New York in the Revolution as Colony and State* (pp. 534) with the imprint 1898. Compiled from records found, arranged and classified by Comptroller Roberts, the volume contains lists of names of members of military organizations, some fifty-two thousand in all, with an index filling half the pages.

The *State Library Bulletin*, History No. 4 (University of the State of New York) is an historical sketch of Slavery in New York, by Judge A. Judd Northrup.

Rev. Dr. Walton M. Battershall has written *A History of St. Peter's Church in the City of Albany* (Albany, Fort Orange Press, Brandow Printing Co.). St. Peter's is described in the introduction as a centre of English missionary work among the Iroquois, while its records furnish material for the colonial and the post-revolutionary period.

Beside pieces continued from the last number, the October issue of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History* contains Colonel Elias Boudinot's notes of two conferences held by the American and British commissioners to settle a general cartel for the exchange of prisoners of war in 1778, Du Coudray's observations (July, 1777) on the forts intended for the defense of the two passages of the River Delaware, and a facsimile of a number of the first German newspaper published in Pennsylvania. This was the *Philadelphische Zeitung*, of which Franklin printed a few numbers in 1732, but of which no copy had ever been discovered till lately. Upon the miscellaneous letters and brief documents which form so rich a portion of the contents of this journal we seldom have space to comment. In the present number we notice two letters of Jasper Yeates advocating the selection of Lancaster as the federal capital in 1789, and one of Samuel Wharton, 1775, urging his brother Thomas to take several members of Congress into partnership in the "Indiana" grant if necessary, in order to secure a validation of that grant by Congress.

Mr. F. R. Diffenderffer has published (New Era Printing Co., Lancaster, Penn.) *The German Immigration into Pennsylvania through the Port of Philadelphia, 1700-1775*. Mr. Diffenderffer published several years ago a monograph entitled *The German Exodus to England*.

Mr. Aksel G. S. Josephson, of the John Crerar Library, Chicago, has in preparation a bibliography of New Sweden.

The September *Publications* of the Southern History Association contains the concluding portion of the journal of Thomas Nicholson, the Quaker preacher, and an account of the Society of the Cincinnati in Virginia.

The October number of the *Virginia Magazine of History* contains much interesting matter. Of a dozen letters of Jefferson here printed, those to Richard Henry Lee are of considerable interest. The installment of Nicholson papers includes, among others, some which describe a barring-out at the College of William and Mary in 1702. The Sainsbury abstracts relate chiefly to the foundation of Maryland. The editor prints some interesting papers gleaned in a tour among the old county court-houses; one of them shows the noted John Saffin selling a Spanish mulatto named Antonio to Ralph Wormeley of Virginia, to be free at the end of ten years.

In the *Lower Norfolk County Virginia Antiquary*, Vol. III., Parts 2, 3, the interesting autobiography of Mrs. Read is concluded; the papers on Grace Sherwood and the Church in Lower Norfolk County and the lists of property-owners of Norfolk County in 1860 and of owners of land and slaves in Princess Anne in 1860 are continued.

The *Randolph-Macon Monthly* for October has a series of letters, hitherto unpublished, relating to the presidential election of 1800, and written in response to the request of Col. Leven Powell, representative from Virginia, by his friends and constituents. They are edited by Professor William E. Dodd.

Dr. Stephen B. Weeks, author of a *Historical Bibliography of North Carolina* published by the Library of Harvard University, will shortly publish a more comprehensive *Bibliography of North Carolina*, embracing all important publications by or concerning North Carolinians or North Carolina.

No. 1 of the *James Sprunt Historical Monographs* (The University of North Carolina Publications) contains an account of the "Personnel of the Convention of 1861," by Mr. John G. McCormick, and of the "Legislation of the Convention of 1861," by Dr. Kemp P. Battle.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* for July continues its account of the Middleton family, for its genealogical section. In the historical portion, the papers of the first Council of Safety and those of the mission of Col. John Laurens to Europe in 1781 are continued. The editor also prints some interesting letters of Justice William Johnson to Jefferson, supplementing the Jefferson letters heretofore printed by him, and the first rules of the St. Cecilia Society, 1773. The October number, besides continuations, deals with the Colleton family.

A Chapter of South Carolina Constitutional History, by David D. Wallace, Ph.D. (Publications of the Vanderbilt Southern History Society, No. 4) deals with the importation of tea into Charleston, in 1773, the refusal by the citizens to allow it to be sold, and the methods of organizing public and political activity that grew out of concerted action upon this juncture and similar occasions. Mr. Wallace points out, incidentally, that the tea landed at Charleston did not "rot in cellars," as was long stated, but was stored for three years, and then confiscated and sold to defray public expenses.

Students of Alabama history may be interested in learning that the letter-book of the adjutant-general's office of the state of Alabama, containing copies of correspondence from January 11, 1861, to July 9, 1863, is now at the adjutant-general's office of the state of Missouri. The correspondent who sends this information says that nothing is known of the history of the book, but that it probably fell into the hands of Missouri troops at the close of the war and was by them carried to Jefferson City.

The October number of the *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* contains four articles of much interest: an eye-witness account of the escape of Karnes and Teal, the Texan commissioners, from Matamoros; reminiscences of Mrs. Dilue Harris, a pioneer, 1833-1836; an article by Mr. Leopold Morris on the Mexican raid of 1875 on Corpus Christi; and one by Mr. Alexander Dienst on New Orleans newspaper files of the period of the Texan revolution.

A correspondent calls our attention to the publication at Seville (D. Vicente Llorens Asensio, calle Garcia di Vimiese 26) of a *Relacion Descriptiva de los Mapas planos de Mexico y Floridas existentes en el Archivo General de Indias*, Vol. I. (pp. 223), by Señor Pedro Torres Lanzas, chief archivist. There are 319 items described, ranging in date from 1519 to 1776. With many maps are included plans of buildings, etc.

The Indiana Historical Society has issued (*Publications*, Vol. III., No. III.) the *Executive Journal of Indiana Territory, 1800-1816*, edited with careful annotations by Messrs. William W. Wollen, Daniel W. Howe, and Jacob P. Dunn.

The Story of John Adams by M. E. B. and H. G. B. (Scribners) gives the record of his life as principal of the Phillips Academy, at Andover, and as a pioneer settler in Illinois, where he labored actively as a missionary for twelve years, establishing, it is said, three hundred and twenty-two Sunday-schools.

The McLean County Historical Society of Bloomington, Illinois, has since its organization in 1892 issued three volumes of *Transactions*. Volume I. contains the "War Record of McLean County;" Volume II. the "School Record;" and recently a third volume has appeared with an account of the first Republican convention in Illinois. This took place in Bloomington, May 29, 1856, and was summoned by the "Anti-Nebraska" newspaper editors of the state. On May 29, 1900, it was commemorated by the Historical Society, with addresses by the surviving members. The volume contains the official report of the convention, the addresses just mentioned, and a biography of Governor Bissell, who owed his nomination to this convention.

The dedication of the new Library Building of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, at Madison, took place October 19. The principal address was that by Mr. Charles Francis Adams, which appears as the first article in the current number of the *REVIEW*. Addresses were also given by the president of the society, Hon. John Johnston, the secretary, Mr. R. G. Thwaites, and Professor McLaughlin of Michigan.

The forty-eighth annual meeting of the Historical Society of Wisconsin was held on December 13, in the new library and museum building. The library is reported as now amounting to 215,606 titles. Volume XV. of the *Collections* is just issued. It contains many documents relating to the formation of the Presbyterian and Methodist churches in Wisconsin, the diary of a New Glarus colonist, and an Indian agent's

report on the economic condition of Wisconsin in 1831, etc. A strong effort is being made to increase the appropriation for the purchase of books.

The July number of the *Annals of Iowa* contains an interesting body of Recollections of Gen. Nathaniel Lyon, by the late Dr. William A. Hammond. The series of articles on the old forts is continued by a short article on Fort Atkinson. The October number deals with Fort Dodge, and has a long article upon Stephen Whicher, a lawyer and early settler in Iowa, by Professor George M. Whicher of Adelphi College.

We note, without being able to resolve the seeming inconsistencies of the title, that there has been published in Zurich a volume of 318 pages entitled *Californien unmittelbar vor und nach der Entdeckung des Goldes: Bilder aus dem Leben des Heinrich Lienhard von Biltten, Kt. Glarus, in Nauvoo, Nord-Amerika.*

Messrs. Constable announce *The Fight with France for North America*, by A. G. Bradley. Beginning with the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle and the conditions and characteristics of the British American colonies and Canada in 1750, Mr. Bradley proceeds to a description of the struggle for expansion in North America. The book has excellent maps.

The Burrows Brothers Company announce a new and complete edition of Charlevoix's *The History and General Description of New France*, translated and edited by the late Dr. John Gilmary Shea, with a new memoir and bibliography of the translator by Noah Farnham Morrison, numerous steel portraits and facsimiles of ancient maps. The edition will be in six volumes and is limited to 750 copies.

Mr. Henry Harrisse has in press the *Découverte et Évolution Cartographique de Terre-Neuve et de la Région Adjacente*. This work will be similar in form to his *Discovery of North America*, and will be issued in a limited edition, by Stevens in London and by Welter in Paris.

In the series of studies published by the University of Toronto, the next historical monograph to appear is one on the Early Trading Companies of New France, by Mr. H. P. Biggar.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. Wilson, *Colonies and Nation*, I. (Harper's Magazine, January); A. D. Morse, *The Significance of the Democratic Party* (International Monthly, October). G. S. Boutwell, *The Last of the Ocean Slave-Traders* (New England Magazine, November); J. Goode, *Recollections of the Confederate Congress* (Conservative Review, September).

